

# THE CLERGY REVIEW

## THE PRIEST'S LIFE IN ITS ENVIRONMENT TO-DAY

### II. HEALTH FOR PASTORAL EFFICIENCY.

By F. M. R. WALSH, M.D., D.Sc., F.R.C.P.

**T**HOSE who may be disinclined, by temperament or by conviction, to give deliberate thought to the care of their health have a number of plausible arguments on their side. Thus, they may reasonably point to the ineffectiveness of that weak vessel the valetudinarian, and to the wholesome horror inspired in all normal men by the individual who can never forget his health, who cannot sit to table without inflicting upon the assembled company the dreary tale of the articles of food he may and may not eat, or without recounting with a wealth of horrid detail the ills he endures if he depart from the fantastic dietary his never-ceasing complaints have induced an exasperated doctor to prescribe for him, and who so often shelters himself behind his obsession when called upon to cross some of the rough places of this life.

While, at the other extreme, they may cite the remarkable activities in all realms of spiritual and secular endeavour of those who throughout life have had to struggle against painful disabilities, and recurrent illness, nor will the calendar of the Saints fail to provide them with many striking illustrations of their thesis. But, as we are so frequently assured, "hard cases make bad law"; few of us can hope to be saints, while no one need be a valetudinarian, and since it is certainly true that we are most effective when we are physically most fit, then surely it is an elementary duty to care adequately for the flesh that is the instrument of the spirit.

We may easily do this without making health—what it should never be—an end in itself.

And if these general considerations fail to impress, we have only to recall to ourselves but a few of the common expressions of the minor degrees of ill-health and to bear in mind that these show themselves not solely in physical symptoms; such as in chronic fatigue, in sleeplessness, in that polymorphic complex of visceral discomforts that we so glibly label “liver” or “indigestion,” and in a legion of other vexations, but also in temperamental aberrations and peculiarities. It is this latter group of symptoms that so commonly escapes recognition for what it is.

Perhaps a few simple examples will serve to illustrate what is in the writer’s mind in this connection. Sufferers from tuberculosis have long been known to develop a characteristic emotional tone, the so-called *spes phthisica*, which may be in evidence before the discovery of its underlying cause. Other diseases give rise to comparable emotional changes that largely determine the individual’s outlook. Manifestations of this order are very diverse and depend for their content and colour upon the temperamental and ethical bases on which they grow, and they may range from a simple depression to an extravagant pietism.

These are, of course, gross examples, but it must be within the experience of most of us that even trifling departures from normal health may play strange tricks with our emotional control and with our judgments of men and affairs. Much apparently unreasonable choler, much prejudice and obstinacy, and not a little of our proneness to wax censorious depend—if the blunt truth is to be told—not upon outraged common-sense nor upon righteous anger, but upon acid dyspepsia or constipation. Nor need we fear to go further and to suggest that in so far as we may find this chilling reflection unwelcome, we probably have the greater need to ponder it.

Indeed, no one will dispute that the heavy responsibilities of the pastoral life, and the conditions of publicity in which the priest has perforce to work and live, make it imperative that he should not be at the mercy of temperamental fluctuations dependent upon physical factors, in so far as by prudent foresight he may avert them. For no one can it be more desirable, than for

the priest, to be able to steer his life upon an even keel, for if he be not able to do so, his difficulties do not end with himself, but may colour his whole pastorate and may be felt by many of his parishioners. In short, the reasonable care of health is not merely a personal, it is a pastoral responsibility.

So much for what *ought* to be our aim in the matter (if the doctor may for once raid the private vocabulary of the ethical expert and lay his profane hands upon this sacrosanct word). We may now pass to consider briefly how this may reasonably be accomplished. It is not the writer's intention in this article to deal seriatim or in detail with every aspect of the care of health. All he desires is to formulate some general principles, based upon considerations that everyone may appreciate. Nor in doing this does he desire to dogmatize unduly, nor to make sweeping generalizations. There is in the human race—and even in our small sub-division of it—enough diversity of temperament and physique to make generalization dangerous. Stock, upbringing, age, and numerous other factors all combine to determine what is desirable for the individual in the matter we are discussing. Thus, to give a familiar example, the powerfully-built man who in youth has taken abundance of strenuous physical exercise is likely to need—well into middle life—if he is not to grow fat and lethargic, a measure of exercise, that might be both unnecessary or even harmful to one of slighter build or less robust physique. There are comparable differences in the requirements of sleep and food between one individual and another. It is the ignoring of these factors that works such havoc among those ingenuous creatures who take their "health hints" from that inexhaustible source of amateur wisdom, the daily Press.

Steering our course, therefore, between rash generalization on the one hand and bewildering qualifications and reservations on the other, let us briefly consider what broad common-sense principles apply generally to the maintenance of mental and physical health.

Let us first take in hand the matter of physical exercise, dealing with this not from the point of view of the physical instructor, but from that of *exercise as a part of recreation*. Exercise should serve two ends; that of

providing for the requirements of the body—the circulatory, muscular and alimentary systems—and that of meeting our needs in the matter of mental change and relaxation. Of these the latter is not less important than the first. It is for the student particularly that sound ideas on this subject are essential, for upon their possession will depend the maintenance of physical and mental equilibrium not only during the strenuous years of his apprenticeship, but also during later life.

In some continental countries walking exercise is regarded as adequately providing all that is needed, and one may see groups of students perambulating quadrangles or cloisters at stated times and for stated periods—like the unwilling guests of some penal institution—while they earnestly discuss the academic topics with which their working hours are filled; reminding one of Browning's dying grammarian, who

settled *Hoti's* business . . .

Properly based *Oun*—

Gave us the doctrine of the enclitic *De* . . .

and so on, when he might more profitably have been pondering other things.

Quite possibly for some men this is sufficient in the way of recreation, but the writer's experience leads him to hold strongly that for our fellow-countrymen this automatic activity is woefully inadequate; unless, indeed, we regard the prevention of constipation as the sole function of exercise; and it may even be an added source of worry.

From our present point of view, exercise should be enjoyable *of itself*, and should not be merely a routine to be endured because it is good for health. It should take the student out of the academic atmosphere and provide him with reasonable opportunities of skill, and of the natural satisfaction that success in some game of skill brings to most normal individuals. This need of making exercise absorbing for the time being—of meeting intellectual and emotional as well as physical needs—is recognized by those enclosed communities whose members work at various handicrafts; gardening, carpentry and the like.

Man has been described as "a tool-using animal" and the cunning of his hands that makes this possible



is one of his characteristic endowments. There is in each one of us a natural urge to use this faculty. In the arts and crafts and in almost every branch of scientific work the need is met, but for some others—the priest, the philosopher and the poet—there is in their work no such opportunity. For these, then, it is the more necessary that recreation should provide what vocation does not.

In doing something skilled with our hands, be it the playing of some game or of some musical instrument, carpentry or painting, drawing or nature study, we are duly employing this special gift, and in so doing we provide for ourselves both exercise and valuable intellectual interests. Thus, a trained pair of hands will often open for us the door of a little world in which we may escape much of the worry of an arduous life.

One of the requirements of rational recreational exercise is that we should get out of harness while we take it, and this may easily be accomplished even when we are restricted to a simple country walk. After all, the order of creation is God's handiwork and as such is worthy of our intelligent study, and at every season of the changing year Nature provides sights of never-ending beauty and interest: the migrations of the birds, their nesting habits and their calls, the trees in their spring beauty and the magnificent bare bones of the countryside when winter has stripped the leaves. Surely, these things provide abundant food for our intellectual and æsthetic needs in the matter of recreation.

The country habit has me by the heart,  
For he's bewitched forever who has seen,  
Not with his eyes but with his vision, Spring  
Flow down the woods and stipple leaves with  
sun, . . .<sup>1</sup>

Yet how commonly we find the student returning to his town life after his years in a country seminary, knowing and caring as little about the order of Nature as when he first entered during adolescence. If the study of nature serve no other purpose, it teaches the

<sup>1</sup> *The Land*, by V. Sackville West. A modern and charming "Georgic" which may be commended to all who have not read it.

habit of accurate observation—a rare gift that, like a sense of humour, we all suppose ourselves to possess.

Lack of foresight in the cultivation of sound habits of lesiure during youth is responsible for much unnecessary and even culpable boredom in later life. We see too frequently the middle-aged or elderly man who spends his hard-earned holiday "filling in time" by aimless sauntering, card playing and sleeping. Of this sad company are those who assure us—with perfect truth, but with a maddening complacency—that they have no other interest than their work, not appreciating that an inability to turn leisure to profit is a defect in any man's equipment, to whatever field of activity he may be called.

In short, for the student exercise is not merely the body's due it is also an aspect of recreation and an essential part of his education for life. Once sound habits in this respect are acquired, and they will not come unsought, they add immeasurably to his efficiency and to his power to maintain physical and mental equilibrium under the severe stresses of an active pastoral life.

Nor need we emphasize the fact that the purely intellectual side of recreation must also be cultivated in youth. The elderly man who falls upon days of retirement when he is past much physical activity is a pathetic spectacle unless he has previously laid by for himself interests on which he can keep his wits sharp and his temper sweet, and fill his days both usefully and pleasantly.

The question of exercise leads us naturally to the more pedestrian topic of some of the discomforts that outdoor activities so often involve in our treacherous climate. If the common cold, that wicked waster of good time, is to be avoided then it is a matter of simple prudence to change damp shoes, socks and garments on returning home.

Any priest who has had to preach to a sneezing and coughing congregation will have had it brought painfully home to him that there is also another aspect of the cold. But in seminaries this perennial nuisance might easily be mitigated by the proper care of catarrhal

infections at the moment of their appearance. The man with a cold in the head owes it to his fellows to look after himself; to retire to bed early after a hot bath, a hot drink and a dose of one or other of the familiar remedies—Dover's powder, aspirin and the like—and for a day or so to keep within doors and as far from his fellows as may be. While for the clearing up of a persistent cold, proper advice should be sought. A number of serious and disabling maladies make the cold their jumping-off place, and it should not be hard for a reasonable individual to steer successfully between undue fussiness and a reckless disregard of health.

And here we may appropriately mention certain morbid and unnecessary preoccupations with health that make their first appearance in early adult life, when they develop at all. Fortunately, most young men adapt themselves to the conditions of community life without conscious difficulty, nor do they find the pace of academic study too hot for them. Even the higher and more exacting studies leave them undisturbed. For such as these no counsel is needed. But there are others, and these not the least intelligent, on whom the progressively increasing demands of life and work bear more heavily. The possession of strong feelings, undue sensitiveness, the yoke of discipline, the demands upon memory and intelligence, one or other of these may engender despondency and anxiety.

Or it may be that we develop some special source of worry; the need of counsel that we hesitate to ask, some complaint that we fear to voice, some cross that must be borne and that we cannot bring ourselves to bear with a good grace, some defect of character that we are trying unsuccessfully to excuse instead of dealing firmly with it.

In these circumstances it is imperative that we should be absolutely frank with ourselves, and seek at once to discover and then to face the root of our particular difficulty. But it is a common weakness of frail human nature that we should try to disguise—from ourselves as well as from others—difficulties that arise in this way, and the taking of refuge in ill-health is a common mode of such disguise.

Let us picture such a situation; when the care-free individual has a headache, he endures it as best he may

and forgets it quickly when it is past, but if such an affliction finds us grappling with some emotional difficulty, some internal conflict between opposing impulses, how easy it becomes to attribute our misfortunes to this Heaven-sent affliction. We begin to feel sorry for ourselves, we assure ourselves that we cannot reasonably be expected to overcome this or that obstacle, to meet this or that demand, when we are ill. The urge to bring our symptom to notice quickly follows. It must be accepted as true coin of the realm—someone else shall be sorry for us too! Soon a veritable obsession about a pain in the head is born, and thus begins one of those never-ceasing, never-waning and year-long "headaches" that defeat all the usual remedies and finally confer upon us the melancholy gratification of having baffled all the arts of the doctor—whose incapacity we do not fail righteously to deplore.

In such ways, self-pity and self-deception become the fruitful parents of a multitude of bizarre "pains" and disorders, all alike in that they are the sands in which we hide our heads and thus blind ourselves to the true origin of our troubles. Indeed, this is soon forgotten, for why should we remember it?

Another unsatisfactory way out of such a situation is the development of sleeplessness. Unfortunately, this is even more serious a disability, for once established it may prove very intractable and bring in its train a host of fatigue symptoms and a progressive unfitness to deal with our own problems—or those of others for whom we may be responsible.

The "pains" and the sleeplessness induced in this way are signs of a failure to resolve an emotional conflict; a conflict that is obvious enough to us at the start, but is soon lost sight of in the symptom it has given birth to.

Despite the tendency of the exponents of the "seven and twenty jarring sects" of the new psychology to relieve the sufferer from all personal responsibility for ills of the order under discussion, and to assume that their origin lies in the subconscious—that convenient waste-paper basket—the writer holds with conviction that many of them (sleeplessness in particular) arise from conflicts of which the sufferer is perfectly well aware, and that a habit of frankness with oneself, and a reasonable measure of fortitude and submission, will

avert—or bring to a speedy end—many examples of this type of symptom.

It has to be admitted, however, that once the habit of sleep has been lost for some time, and from whatever cause, it may need definite medical treatment. Into this aspect of the matter it is manifestly impossible here to go. But there are many simple devices by which we may outwit the devil of wakefulness. When at night time the mind races on and will not be quieted, we may often switch it off from its preoccupation by a half-hour's reading before retiring to bed; poetry for the fortunate ones who love it, light fiction, essays, biography—no matter what, so that it is something quite different from the day's affairs and something that we enjoy. Even the humble game of patience, or the crossword puzzle may not be without soporific virtues. The short "constitutional" beneath the stars (when the Heavens are kind), the warm bath and the hot drink are all familiar aids to sleep, and when any or all of these fail us then it is time to seek advice, either ghostly or medical, as our intuition dictates.

In dealing at so great length with this question of anxiety states, and the bodily symptoms associated therewith, the writer may seem to have departed from his thesis. However, if by health we understand mental as well as physical well-being, then it will be admitted that these considerations are very much to the point. Nor can we even yet regard the matter as dealt with in all its aspects, for not only does emotional conflict bring in its train numerous bodily symptoms, but even more clearly must it influence our outlook towards our fellow men, their deeds and misdeeds. How often, indeed, are not our judgments and our application of principles tinctured by our own emotional colouring, and force lent to our inherent disposition to

compound for sins we are inclined to,  
by damning those we have no mind to.

The writer can assure his readers that this is no over-coloured or uncommon picture that he has tried to paint. Indeed, on reflection many will recall having seen the like in their own circle of acquaintances; the self-centred man who wields a strange and unconvincing

illness like a cudgel about the ears of his intimidated and guiltily-resentful relatives, or the man with "a bee in his bonnet" perpetually buzzing round some topic on which he thunders forth devastating—and not uncommonly, extremely uncharitable—judgments, betraying only too clearly that the shoe pinches him somewhere.

It is in youth that the foundations of these unhealthy modes of thought and reaction are laid, but once laid, the craving to make oblique excuses for ourselves, and to disguise them in the cloak of ill-health or by the adoption of some perverse crusading zeal, grows throughout life until it becomes second nature.

The writer does not wish the conscientious reader—if any have followed him so far—to begin to suspect himself, when bodily illness befalls him of being the victim of an anxiety state. He simply wishes to point out that just as bodily ailments may colour our feelings and our opinions, so also mental and emotional stress—if not properly dealt with—may bring in its train a host of apparently physical ills that are often no more than disguises with which we drape and so conceal from ourselves what are essentially psychological upsets, or may give a bias to our thoughts and feelings.

Nor does he pretend that the victim of one or other of these deviations from health of mind or body can invariably make his own diagnosis. Indeed, the differentiation of physical illness from a mentally engendered derangement of bodily functions is one of the most difficult tasks that may confront the doctor. Not only may the most dramatic symptoms and the appearances of grave bodily illness present themselves in individuals who are absolutely free from all structural disease of the body, but they may overlay the signs of bodily illness and thus render it apparently severe and grossly disabling. The theatrical recoveries often made by invalids of this order under stress of strong feeling are at once a proof of their emotional nature, and a demonstration of the vast rôle that unsound thinking and defect of emotional control may play in the genesis of bodily disability.

Yet difficult as this question is, there can be nothing but good in our all knowing that there do exist these delicate and readily upset relations between mind and body. Forewarned is forearmed, and it is important



that we should all realize that, viewed in its broadest sense, the maintenance of health involves not merely the due care of the body by appropriate exercise and personal hygiene, but the cultivation of firm emotional control and of clear thinking. The failure of any one of these factors may set in train a sequence of disabilities that will adversely affect both peace of mind and soundness of body.

The responsibilities and the delicacies of the pastoral relation make it highly desirable that the priest should understand something of the reciprocal activities of mind and body, and to this end he should possess and cultivate insight into his own mental and emotional processes. If he does not understand himself, he can hardly hope to understand or to guide others.

We may now be said to have covered—though summarily—the two main aspects of our title; that is, the dependency of pastoral efficiency upon health. We have discussed the broad implications of the notion of health, and have considered the relationships of its two components, mental and physical.

To pass from these somewhat facile generalizations to a consideration of the various minor bodily disorders that we may have to tend, or to discuss the ways and means we have to adopt to keep our bodily mechanisms working sweetly would be in the nature of an anticlimax. It is not the writer's intention or his function to re-write that old ornament of the domestic library, *The Family Doctor*; since others with special experience are to deal explicitly with some at least of these things.

But it will be apparent that we have to pay due attention—in a commonsense manner and without fuss—to every appearing derangement; constipation, indigestion and the like. No one of them can wisely be left to go unchecked. We have to eat according to our physical activities, to space our meals reasonably and to distribute our allowance of nourishment sensibly. No one, for example, can expect to be mentally alert in the afternoon who overloads his luncheon table. The heavy midday meal may be all very well for the manual labourer whose ever-active muscles burn up the fuel he provides, but for the man who employs his head more

than his brawn the evening is the time for the principal meal. This is, of course, of more importance in middle age than in youth.

Finally, the writer is not unaware that many of his suggestions may savour of counsels of perfection; exasperating in their unpractical nature. The busy overworked priest has no time for exercise, no energy left for recreation, no leisure to deal calmly with his worries. The doctor, not less, suffers from these disadvantages, but would nevertheless admit that the responsibility to maintain as sound a regime as possible still remains.

Moreover, if the truth be told, we often find that the man who has no time to look after himself, might easily provide the time did he but manage his affairs with reasonable method.

In the life of every busy and responsible man there are items of routine that are a vexation to the spirit; administrative details and the keeping of accounts to some, the answering of letters and suchlike to others. The man who rushes breathlessly through life generally contrives to put off as long as possible whatever he does not like, and finally when arrears overwhelm him and his affairs are in a complete tangle he has to devote far more time and vitality to straighten them out than would have been necessary had he cleared up as he went along. To clear up as we go—our routine work, our private problems—to start each week with a clean slate, to keep notes of what we are like to forget (and we invariably forget what we have no satisfaction in remembering), to set apart a time for each job, in short, to be methodical, this is to find ample time for what is really essential. These observations are, of course, platitudes, the beggarly rudiments of common-sense, known by all, but neglected by most. Yet, if by repeating them, we can expose the hollowness of most pleas of "no time" then we shall not have reiterated in vain.

## THE LOSS OF WALES

BY DAVID AND GERVASE MATHEW.

**A**MONG all the countries of Western Europe, it was in Wales that the defeat of the Catholic Church was most complete. This was not the result, as in Scotland, of the victory of some powerful faction, but it was rather a surrender after a long encirclement and slow starvation. It is not disputed that, at the time of the Reformation, the practices of Catholicism were deeply rooted among the people, nor were the Welsh lacking in leaders: what failed was the output of priests. The following study is an attempt to suggest an explanation of one aspect of the question, that utterly alien speech and background and temper of mind, which divided the Welsh from all the non-Celtic countries. It is true, of course, that the needs of England were much greater and it was not a question of an absence of endeavour and sympathy on the part of the English, but rather the presence of a barrier, that lack of all understanding, which they could not avoid. The religion of a country stands or falls by the quality and number of the priests for the home mission that its people provide, and a consideration of the life of Bishop Lewis, who was the most active leader of the Welsh Catholics, may help to explain how this vital element failed. This aspect of the Welsh background is one that English writers have in general neglected, but by considering the Catholic leader, as seen against the life of his time, it may be possible to trace some of the forces which caused the religious life of the Welsh to founder.

A sense of deep unchanging isolation has always divided the untrammelled Celtic spirit from the calmer peoples of the Eastern fields, and in no aspect of life is this more marked than in the practice of religion, where the patriarchal custom of the Celtic gatherings contrasted with the complex and settled English ways. For, across the stretches of Wales, open and bare of enclosures, there was the day's work for the Welshmen in the

grudging and rock-sown soil and the pastures, and in the evenings the ale at the rough-fashioned tables, with the singing of the long monotonous legends of Gwynedd and Powys, against the wind rising in gusts through the valleys. In the background there were all the complicated duties and bonds of the kinship and above them the protection of Lord Michael the Angel and the holy host of the saints. Llanvihangel, Llanvihangel, how constantly is this name of Saint Michael repeated across the empty and desolate spaces? It was a life with a pattern, simple and broad, and with an almost migratory instinct in the ebb and flow of the pilgrims, while the reverend elders lamented the last carving up of the shire ground. Even yet, the ancestral and almost mythical divisions still lingered and all the men would now gather from the old lands of Gwerthrynion and Elfael to honour the saints in the calm nights, as the torches wavered.<sup>1</sup> It was this essential remoteness of the Celtic life which rendered assistance impossible, for Welsh priests, and these were denied her, could alone keep the allegiance of Wales. There were few subordinates, although there were leaders, and in the gradual failure of these men there is marked the doom of the Old Church in their country, for while Owen Lewis, for instance, had contacts with the English and Romans and French, his career only served to confirm how deep was the cleavage. For, although he possessed a theologian's equipment, Dr. Lewis had the fundamental simplicity of the Cymric Middle Ages, and in his failing efforts for his country, he went down before the complex modern world. There were three stages in his endeavour to sustain the fading religion of his people, which correspond to the scenes of his thirty years' exile, Douai and Rome and Milan, the check, the defeat and in the end the frustration.

Although he had lived among them so long, Dr. Lewis could never really understand the point of view of the English, for he had gone to Winchester late and he was already past twenty before he reached Oxford and then

<sup>1</sup> For the survival of Catholic pilgrimages during and after the Reformation period, see British Museum Add. MSS. 814,972, and *Ode to the Four Brothers* in Llyfr Ceniath, British Museum Add. MSS. 14,940 and 14,989, *Ode to the Choir of Heaven*, and Llanstephan MSS. 47, f. 809 and 164, f. 166.

he had been obliged to cross over to France to avoid the Queen's new religion. There had come with him from the University some other Catholics, Dr. Allen and his personal following, as well as the stray Catholic Welshmen who made Oxford their home. They were received at Douai and welcomed, but this beginning of exile was perhaps hardly auspicious for Wales, for it is of capital importance, the divergence of intention and hope between Lewis and Allen. A plan, which they both supported, was the setting up of a college to supply their nations with priests, and they were suitable leaders, for their devotion to the Holy See was unquestioned and their external peace was not broken, but it was impossible for one type of college to provide both for England and Wales. For behind Allen there was all the long established and careful tradition of the church life of England, ordered selective, efficient; but the Welsh priests were as free and untethered as the sheep on their mountains.

In those early days of discussion at the table at Douai, the situation became outlined so clear, William Allen at the head, with the Canon's stall in York Minster and the Principalship to give him authority and that manner, courteous and grave, as he put forward his detail. There was so much support that he could count on, from the strong farmers and squires all over Lancashire, and the whole of the North, in fact, was so Catholic. And then he would speak of what he had heard up at Rossall, with before his mind always the simple map of the Fylde, every farm and its owner known to him and their spirit of Faith. Thus it was not easy for him to consider in detail the question of training the Welsh, although that was a matter that Mr. Lewis and old Mr. Precentor Philipps were always discussing, until the latter went wandering off into one of those philosophic and would-be humorous tangles, which had earned him the name at Oxford of Morgan the Sophister. Yet Dr. Allen was most anxious that Mr. Lewis should not be discouraged.

In every other matter, except the preservation of Wales, there was no tendency to discourage Owen Lewis at all. His work was successful in the theological faculty at Douai, but his rewards were also considerable, the chair of Canon Law, which had just been created; and a Canon's stall at Cambrai, to eke out the inadequate stipend; and, finally, when his legal powers were well

tested, the important post of Archdeacon of Hainault. He was valued as a very sound canonist, and his preference for conversing in Latin, fluent if not very elegant, was welcome to the Low Country priests. It is this external success which is admitted and grasped, but it is sometimes forgotten that all the while he was halting in the Western languages and spoke Latin better than English and looked steadily back to Welsh. So, although he had a theologian's and a canonist's knowledge, how great was the contrast with his fellow professors! They had behind them the solid and burgher inheritance of the Low Country cities, with the memory of the votive lamps in their own guild chapel and all that ease in the quiet sunlight that fell on the chests and the Memling linen. This was an inheritance that was still their possession, a life that continued beside their theology.

But Lewis was a wanderer, at home neither in England, nor France, an exile alone with the memories of his wide and solitary country, the tide making and the heavy sea upon Malldraeth, the rain beating uneven on the new and the old thatching, and the warmed ale and the song. And now he was far from Anglesey and his life was passed in all the discussions of the schools and the long wearied law cases with the feudal lord and the Crown about the tolls and dues of the Lord Bishop, which were contested by His Catholic Majesty for his County of Hainault. Yet, this could assist so little in the desire of his life, the restoration of the old worship in Wales, where he could remember so well the feast day at Llangadwaladr,<sup>2</sup> with the heavy carts lurching across the rough tracks of the island and the gathering at the altar of all the prime men of his country and, in the high seat by the chancel, the old and white-bearded "Esgwier," dozing at the thought of the roast that his bounty provided, while the haze drifted from the fine chimney with which he had replaced the smoke vent at the House of Bodorgan.

It was abundantly clear that nothing would be done for the Welsh in these first beginnings at Douai; but as Dr. Lewis's external career developed it always seemed

<sup>2</sup> The state of Anglesey is described in Williams' Add. MSS. 184d at Aberystwyth, while a contemporary account of the local customs is to be found in Sir John Wynn's *Historie of Gwydyr*.



possible that some opportunity to aid his countrymen might arise. Then, by a good chance, he was summoned to Rome on a lawsuit for the Chapter of Cambrai, and, attracting a favourable notice, was made Refendarius of the two Segnature. Meanwhile, the plans of Dr. Allen and his advisers for the training of priests were developing, first the College at Douai, the move to Rheims and then Rome, while fortune suddenly gave the control of the new Roman house to the Welshmen. How impossible it was for the old free Celtic temperament to adapt itself to the needs of the English or the new Tridentine Italians, and it is easiest to survey the disaster from that Ash Wednesday morning of 1579 when the administration of the English College had fallen in ruins.

The situation was perfectly simple, for all the English students, thirty-three out of forty, had left in a body and the clamour of their going was only just dying away through the streets of the city. Monsignor Owen, as he was now known since his papal appointment, was left alone in the College, with the ancient and garrulous rector, Dr. Morys Clynog, some seven Welsh students, who were mainly relations, and the admirable and courteous Fathers of the Society, who had been brought in to teach the just vanished apostles. It had all been the fault of old Bishop Goldwell, that excellent and benevolent man, who, like the eternal prelates of Rome, would from time to time come down to dinner. He had been mainly responsible for the appointment of Morys Clynog, which, as far as Owen could make out, would seem to have been the root of the trouble. For Dr. Maurice, as he was called, was one of the old school of clergy, irreproachable in his morals, but perfectly untouched by the new Tridentine reforms. Like Goldwell, he had belonged to the late Cardinal Pole's household, and had been Dean of Croydon, while, at the moment of Queen Mary's death, he was Bishop-elect of Bangor; but it is significant that no Pope felt impelled to confirm him or to offer him some other see. Of course, he had hardly kept up his learning<sup>3</sup> and he certainly

<sup>3</sup> According to a report of Owen Lewis, "the chaplains (of the English Hospice) although pious were old and not addicted to studies of any kind," Vatican MS. 3494, Dr. Clynog was then among their number.

was not a preacher, but he had been Warden of the old-fashioned Hospice, and he was clearly the man on the spot. Owen Lewis felt bound to support him and certainly, as Allen had said,<sup>4</sup> he was very "honest and friendly," and then they shared the same background, for Owen knew his village so well, Clynnog, where the hill tracks out of Lleyn past Llanaelhaiarn dip down from the moors to the Anglesey waters. But Dr. Clynnog had no gifts of management and this was the immediate reason for the refusal of duty, which the English students had made. As to the Fathers of the Society, who were now in the house, they formed an element quite apart from Owen's previous knowledge; but they were religious men and were doing a wonderful work, which His Holiness often attested; while in the case of the English boys he could not understand them at all.

To Fr. Alfonso Agazzari, the senior of the three Jesuit teachers, the situation was clearer. It had been his privilege to receive, while quite young, the call to leave his good Sienese home and to enter holy religion, and now he had been instructed by his superiors to assist in forming the characters of these youths who were destined to be the new apostles of England. He had already acquaintance with Fr. Parsons, that excellent English religious with his apt Scriptural quotations and his truly Catholic ideals and the careful "bonhomie" that made recreation so pleasant. As for Dr. Maurice, the Rector, he was a worthy old man, but somewhat lacking in that control which a priest should possess, and for him to shout *abire in malam Crucem*<sup>5</sup> at the students was hardly a dignified ending for this regrettable squabble. With regard to the wish of the students to have one of Ours as their ruler, that was of no value at all, for Fr. Agazzari had no desire save that the Glory

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Dr. Allen at Paris to Dr. Lewis, dated 12th May, 1579, and printed in Tierney—Dodd, ii. p. 366.

<sup>5</sup> According to the account sent by Mr. Haddock at Rome to Dr. Allen, dated 9th March, 1579. The version given by the spy, Anthony Munday, in *English Romaine Life*, Harl. Misc. vii, although quite unreliable is very diverting. "And many nightes he (the Rector) must have the Welshmen in his chamber, where they must be merry at good cheer: wee glad to sit in our studies and have an ill supper. . . . Maister doctor's nephew, Morganus Glenokus, he must be in his silke, though all the rest go in a sacke."

of God should increase under the guidance of the Holy Father, who was the custodian of the good of the Church. At last, after all these days of dispute, he could prepare the points of his meditation more carefully, undisturbed by the high noise of the wrangling, and good would thus come out of evil.

Upstairs, on the "piano nobile," the Rector was also enjoying a moment of freedom, while he could view with more equanimity these disturbing events, as the wine from his own vineyard on the Via Aurelia sank down in his glasses. He was still as "honest" as ever, but he had grown increasingly "friendly" with age. Beside him was his nephew, young Morgan; and the Monsignor's nephew, Hugh Griffith, who had leaped in the College Hall, shouting: "Who now but a Welshman," a gallant boy, but tempestuous; and then there was Lewis Hughes, the Monsignor's cousin, with his sharp North Welsh wit; and Meredith, that man, strong and determined, who had raised his knife at the English and was making such a fine attempt to begin to learn Latin. The English had accused the Rector of favouring the Welsh and of bringing in ignorant students, but surely he had only done what a nobly descended Christian should do? It was an honour that his elder brother, the head of his line, should send out his son to his care to learn to offer the Sacrifice and to call down on the fields of his people the blessings of the saints of his race. Nothing could be more clear than his obvious duty to share with his kinsmen the last crust of the Hobnails, as the English were so justly called, and now the talk could run freely at last on the stock of Collwyn ap Tangno and the saints of the high lords of Gwynedd.<sup>6</sup>

Dr. Owen Lewis often made mistakes about people and he had supported the adventurer Stukeley, for instance, yet there were moments when no one could fail to see the coming disaster. That very afternoon the Pope, returning from Santa Sabina, the first Station at the

<sup>6</sup> An instance of this outlook is to be found in a statement in Lewis Owen's *Running Register* (1626), p. 17. "The English Hospital yea and this seminarie were in times past the Palace of Cadwallader, Prince of Wales who . . . gave his House or Palace to bee an Hospital for Welsh pilgrims." It is not difficult to imagine the effect of this particular claim to the exclusive government of the College.

opening of Lent, had been pressed to make a decision. There had been mismanagement and the chance for Wales had vanished and Owen Lewis rode away from Rome. Although his departure was neither immediate nor final, for he did not leave for Milan until June, 1580, this was the moment at which his active concern with the government of the English College and with the supply of priests ceased. He was still staying at the College when, through no efforts of the Society, Fr. Agazzari was appointed to take Dr. Maurice's place and to rule the now returned English, and he lived in Rome again after the death of Saint Charles Borromeo and during his tenure of the Calabrian see of Cassano. But, in the last years of Dr. Lewis's life, from his appointment to the Bishopric in 1588 until his death at Rome, at the age of sixty-two, in 1594, he had no real share in the furthering of religion in Wales, for his previous efforts had failed, and the outbreak of the war between England and Spain made him still farther remote from his country. Yet, if there was no real contact between the English and Welsh, the direct needs of the Catholics in Wales also failed to impress that careful and sagacious temper of mind with which the decisions of Trent had marked the new rulers. For Owen Lewis, prosecuting his upward career, became Vicar General to Saint Charles Borromeo at Milan and one of his "family," and in this phase of his life it is clear how his hopes for Wales were frustrated, caught and swept aside by the Europe-wide movement of that Cardinal's affairs, as he faltered, a mediæval survival, beside the strength and the pressure of the great Tridentine machine.

At Douai there had been a small College with the talk at the table led by old Morgan the Sophister under the controlled silence of Allen, with his grave and courteous smile, while in the hurly-burly at Rome there were just a few English and Welshmen and the Jesuit Fathers, but at Milan there was that vast princely household, which the Reforms of Trent had not decreased, but had chastened, with all the business of State. The picture, which Giovanni Pietro Giussano, who was one of the Cardinal's chaplains, has drawn us, can provide an idea of that seething ecclesiastical tide upon which Dr. Owen Lewis was carried. For a household of over a hundred surrounded the Cardinal, all grouped in a well-balanced

hierarchy under the Praepositus, Antonio Seneca. It was so easy amid such movement to be lost in that crowd, with the Vicar and the twelve Chamberlains under him, all priests and doctors, and the Economus, and below him the Almoners and the Stewards and the Prefects of the Guest Chambers with their subordinate staffs, in addition to the continual ebb and flow of the three hundred guests in the month.<sup>7</sup> And then there was the endless arrival of messengers from the princes, the result of the awe, and almost the fear, in which the Lord Cardinal was held, as the holy man of his century, as the great Thaumaturgus, who could pierce on its under side that curious astrological fear, which was the weakest point in the system of Catherine de Medici and her perverted, Italianate sons. Even the Elector Augustus of Saxony, of the straitest sect of the Lutherans, sought his counsel and princes like Emmanuel Philibert wooed him with relics, an unending stream of petition, which makes it clear that the claim of the Welsh to assistance could not fail to be swept under the weight of these burdens. While, in the more immediate circle of the Cardinal, there was the Auditor General to be faced, Monsignor Bernardine Morra, "a prelate of great prudence and care," and the young and serious Oblates, and that experienced Father of Society, Achille Gagliardi. Beyond these, the Monitors of His Eminence, were the "Discreets" of the Confraternity and by contrast up in the Mesolcina, that legacy from an earlier age the sorcerer Quattrini; whilst, as a constant factor, the Civil Power strained into opposition, with the Governor Don Carlos of Aragon on his dais, below the choir of the Duomo, to represent the uneasy rights of Spain; and then at this hub of the new revival, where the Catholic travellers came streaming from the North, there was the entry of the soldiers of the train of the Most Illustrious Andreas Bathori and all the Embassy of the "Respublica Poloniae," the kettle drums upon the Eastern Road.<sup>8</sup> Calm in the maelstrom, unaffected at its still, unmoving centre, was the figure of the Cardinal, Saint Charles.

<sup>7</sup> Giussano *Vita di San Carlo*, Book VIII, c. 26.

<sup>8</sup> Giussano, op. cit. VIII, c. 26. Andreas Bathori with Pan Alexander Nevski stayed in the Cardinal's palace with fifty of their retinue.

He is a character, strange and elusive, and, at the centre of a company whose motives we can understand so clearly, suddenly disinterested and remote. It is a most interesting problem to attempt to reconstruct the attitude of Saint Charles towards the Welsh. His influence in politics greatly exceeded his interest, which was dominated by that benevolence, impersonal and quite universal, which was, as it were, the distillation of his zeal for the service of God. It was an unforgettable impression, the slightly bent form of the Cardinal, the almost Cyrano nose, the sunk cheeks, carefully shaven, the eyes, blue under the half-closed eyelids, as His Eminence would enter quietly with that hesitant, dragging step that erysipelas had brought him. Nor did this constraint decrease as he spoke, with his low voice scarcely audible,<sup>9</sup> the hands cold even in summer from the insufficient circulation, with, in his manner, that studied avoidance of gesture and absence of laughter, and accompanying every movement that careful and so impersonal smile, almost continuous. Before his mind there were always the subjects of the spiritual reading and of those set retreats he valued so greatly, and over all his days was a sameness, the bare, solitary meals in the centre of this magnificent household, the thin bread soup, the dish of lupines; and then at night the folding bedstead and the hair shirt, carefully mended. It is difficult to see what contact the spirit of the mediæval Welsh in Dr. Lewis could make with this outlook, beside his reports as Vicar General; for the material background of the Cardinal's life had this same definiteness and precision, the formal Borromean garden at Isola Bella he had abandoned with the careful range of statues in the ilex and the stone. Yet what could be in greater contrast to the noisy ale-warmed fathers and their loud, uncertain singing and the waters under Malldraeth and the freedom of the Welsh?

Owen Lewis's practical hopes were quite abandoned; yet he had a deep affection for the Cardinal, who in his turn had a devotion for the Welsh, and Bishop Goldwell had been his Vicar General and he had kept, as his confessor for fifteen years, the Canon Theologian,

<sup>9</sup> Deposition of Fr. Achille Gagliardi, S.J., at the Process of Canonization from which the other physical detail is largely drawn, *ibid.*, VII, cc. 17-8.



Griffith Roberts, the author of *Drych Cristionogawl*. But, in his profoundly Christo-centric life, it was not any accidental friendship which drew the Cardinal's attention to these men, for he honoured them as representing the suffering members of Christ's mystical body. In the calm of his withdrawn existence, in the six hours, which he would spend in preparing for his Mass, he would think of how the Holy Sacrifice was reviled and of all the altars cast down, and it was as Confessors, as those who had endeavoured to keep unsullied the seamless garment of Christ, that he honoured the Welsh. This was a line of reasoning which Canon Roberts and Dr. Lewis could follow, but it did not assist them; for it had no contact with practical matters. To the Cardinal it was clear that the Divine Will had called him to the See of Milan and the world was in the Holy Father's care, but he would assist them with his prayers.

For four years Dr. Lewis served the Cardinal, a time of strong and mutual personal devotion and yet, in human terms, so ineffective; and then, on 3rd November, 1584, there came the breaking of this partnership, a scene typical in its contrast between the strong new age and the old Wales sinking. A great horde surrounded the dying Cardinal, lying ill of a tertian fever, which incapacitated him from mental prayer, on a pallet bed and ashes in one of the high public halls of the palace, called from the paintings of Gethsemane and the Passion, the audience chamber of the Cross. Kneeling in the privileged place beside the pillow were Count Jacob Hannibal d'Altaemps and Renato Borromeo, the courtier kinsmen, stiff and worldly, from the Escorial, accustomed to the *decor* of princely deaths; and behind them the Major Duomo and the household and the Archpriest and the Canons; and over all the sound of the high reading of the Passion and the noise of lamentation and outside the crowds of Milan surging against the halberds of the Guard. It was a great room, crowded and draughty, with the fires on the hearth stones roaring and lighting up the black liveries of the Cardinal's servants and the frescoed ceiling and the high, bare white walls, which in the plague of '76 had been stripped of their hangings.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Evidence of Fr. Panigarola at the Process.

Through the evening, Owen Lewis knelt supporting the Cardinal, while the cold wind from the glaciers came down, when the sun had set, over the city and the draughts played over the flooring; and all the time, except for the lull as the Duke of Terranova came with his Switzers, there was the noise of the discreet surging of priests, and behind them the packed humanity and the great fires and the heat; but the failing eyes of the Cardinal saw only the Crucifix. The Welsh, having failed to establish a centre for the training of priests, had now lost their protector. About these exiles, the Tridentine movement of renewal still gathered in strength and the tide of the Catholic Religion slowly returned over the reaches lying abandoned, but not to Welsh Wales.

## "MEN OF LITTLE SHOWING"

(8) THE RIGHT REVEREND BERNARD WARD,  
Bishop of Brentwood.

BY THE RIGHT REV. MGR. CANON MYERS, M.A.

**M**ONSIGNOR BERNARD WARD, President of St. Edmund's College (1893-1916), and later first Bishop of Brentwood, was an outstanding figure in the Catholic life of England in the early twentieth century. In a way he was well-known, but those who knew him best will always hold that the real man was known to few, that under the bluff and abrupt manner there lay a singularly sensitive spiritual character. All external manifestation of his deeper sentiments he rigorously repressed: "his life was hidden with Christ in God," his place is marked out among "Men of Little Showing."

His father was William George Ward, "Ideal" Ward of the Oxford Movement, who was born in 1812, became a Catholic in 1845, and went to live at Old Hall. From 1851 to 1858 he was Professor of Theology to the ecclesiastical students of the South of England.

From his father, Bernard Ward derived more than mere intellectual ability and force of character: saintly example, ideals and outlook left a much deeper impression upon him than he was aware of, so much so, that it would be true to say that without some knowledge of his father's life our appreciation of the son would be incomplete. Page after page of W. G. Ward's life might well be used to describe Bernard Ward. Those who knew Mgr. Ward have often been surprised to see that characteristics they had thought peculiar to him, were equally to be found in his father. A few quotations may be allowed to tell their own story.

"And so it came to pass," writes Wilfrid Ward, "that not theology as a merely abstract science, but the formation of the priestly character, was his great interest. He enlarged his acquaintance with the literature of the

'interior life,' which had ever been so attractive to him, and endeavoured to blend it with Dogmatic Theology. In the voluminous correspondence with Cardinal Wiseman and the other responsible superiors at that time, an ideal priesthood, and the discipline necessary to its formation, is the one topic. The 'science of the saints,' the spiritual exercises, the art of meditation, spiritual direction—these were the subjects with which he wished to make the future priests more and more familiar. Dogma was treated not merely as the teaching of theologians, but as the food of saints; and the lectures themselves were designed to show its practical use in the spiritual life—in the daily meditation of the educated priest, in the simpler prayers of the poor."<sup>1</sup>

The College chapel at Old Hall impressed his imagination as the scene of far more important events than Downing Street. "What place do you think in all England does the devil look to for his most dangerous work?" he suddenly asked of the Vice-President in the course of a walk. "That building," he continued, pointing to the College, and he proceeded to explain his meaning. "The Catholic religion is the great hope for England. The advance of Catholicism depends under God, almost entirely on a good priesthood. The large majority of the priests are formed at the College. If he can succeed in damaging the priestly spirit at the College, the bulk of England's future priests are damaged, and the country is irreparably injured."<sup>2</sup>

In the recollections of his eldest daughter, Mary, we read:<sup>3</sup>

"He was always very free from human respect, and sometimes took a mischievous pleasure in shocking people by bringing out some of his most original feelings and opinions." ". . . when he thought that a state of things was arising which would seriously injure the priestly spirit of the students, he could not sleep, and would spend the nights chiefly in walking up and down his room." "One curious peculiarity was his horror of being thought pious . . ." ". . . he had a horror of anything like taking liberties with God or the Sacra-

<sup>1</sup> *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival*. London, 1893, p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, p. 41.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*, pp. 68-72.

ments, especially if people's lives were not altogether consistent with it. He did not like too frequent communions, except in those who were leading very holy mortified lives . . . yet he would hardly venture to give an opinion on such matters as being quite above him; but you could see which way his bias tended." "Still he liked the genuine article in point of piety, and never had any faith in sanctity if accompanied by any appearance of self-consciousness or conceit."

"Of his tender affectionateness and delicate sympathy and consideration I need not speak. No one could have been more responsive or more intensely sensitive to any want of response on the part of others. If he did not feel deaths he was keenly alive to the least want of affection . . . There must have been a veritable depth of wounded feelings in his early life, for it always seemed as if there were wounds in his heart that wanted continual soothing and anointing."

The testimony borne by an affectionate daughter to her father, will appeal with startling emphasis—all due allowances being made—to those who really knew Mgr. Ward.

Wilfrid Ward warns us that: "It would be out of place in speaking of one who so much hated the ostentation of piety to dwell at great length on his spiritual life; but the impression on this subject of the few that knew him intimately must be recorded. It was naturally at variance with that of those who knew him only under the conditions of reserve, which in connection with his inner history was remarkable in so outspoken a man."<sup>4</sup>

Bernard Nicholas Ward was born at Old Hall on February 4th, 1857. Cardinal Wiseman was his godfather, and hence his second name. All his schooldays were passed at St. Edmund's, where he came in August 1868, under Dr. Rymer. During his school-days he was a lay-boy, and he left St. Edmund's in 1875 with no thought of becoming a priest. He paid a visit to the United States, and settled down to go through the training for the profession of surveyor and land-agent. In 1879 he made a pilgrimage to Lourdes with his favourite sister Margaret, and it was on Rosary Sunday of that

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.*, p. 69.

same year that he first realized that he was called to the Priesthood. He went to Oscott in January, 1880, to study his Theology under Dr. Barry, and later, Dr. McIntyre. He received the Subdiaconate from Bishop Weathers in Advent, 1881, and the Diaconate on Holy Saturday, 1882. His father died on July 6th. In August he was appointed Prefect at Old Hall, and on October 8th received the Priesthood from Cardinal Manning, at the old Archbishop's House, Westminster. He ceased being Prefect in 1885, and on February 4th, 1886, he founded in apostolic poverty the mission of Willesden. In 1888 Canon Souter invited him to go and teach Chemistry and Biology at Oscott. Recalled by Cardinal Manning in August, 1890, he was appointed Vice-President under Mgr Crook. January 2nd, 1892, saw the death of Cardinal Manning, April 8th the appointment of Archbishop Vaughan. In December, 1892, the Archbishop made him Pro-President, and in January, 1893, President. His long Presidency of twenty-three years closed in 1916, and for a short time he was Rector of Hammersmith. April 10th, 1917, saw him Bishop of Lydda, and Administrator-Apostolic of Essex. On July 20th he became Bishop of Brentwood, and on January 21st, 1920, death came to him as he would have wished—sudden but not unprovided.

*The* characteristic of Mgr. Ward's life was that of a great priest: his life was priestly, his ideals were priestly. From the moment he recognized his vocation there was nothing for him in life but the service of God in the Priesthood. He deliberately cut himself off from every other interest. Mere social functions saw him no more. His time was God's, and to the interests of God he gave it with ruthless completeness.

When he returned to Oscott in October, 1888, the air was full of the celebration of the Golden Jubilee of the College, its historical records were published in *The Oscottian*, the President was made a Domestic Prelate in July. Then the unexpected blow fell: Bishop Ullathorne closed Oscott as a Lay College. In 1890 Bernard Ward became Vice-President of St. Edmund's, and he made it one of his first duties to overhaul the historical records of Old Hall, and 1893 saw the publication of "The History of St. Edmund's College." The great glories of the English Secular Clergy became familiar figures to him.



Archbishop Vaughan, on his appointment to the See of Westminster, had found the College in a critical state: numbers were low, finances were bad. He was undecided as to whether the College should continue, or the property be realized. Father Ward was appointed Pro-President, and his vigorous administration justified the choice. Writing at a later date, Mgr. Ward tells us that the Archbishop " indicated in no ambiguous terms that should I fail in securing the requisite support, there would be no alternative but to close the College, as he had no money that he could apply to it." From that fate he saved the College.

In History for history's sake Mgr. Ward had no interest. The trend of his mind was mathematical and scientific. In his home life philosophical and theological interests had predominated: the children were not discouraged from intervening in general conversation—on condition they could give a sound reason for what they had to say. As a boy and a young man he had met most of the men who were prominent in the religious and philosophical life of England: he disclaimed any pretension to being a Philosopher or a Theologian—yet the bland but devastating questions he could put when he thought it desirable, were a warning to the presumptuous.

In a self-revealing page Mgr. Ward tells us (*Priestly Vocation*, p. 3): " it would be a great mistake to underestimate—as so many of the early Oxford converts did—the sterling qualities of the priesthood of the Vicariates. A more unworldly set of persons, with greater conscientiousness and devotion to duty, has hardly existed in any age of the Church. Their life had a hardness and a simplicity about it which might well be a lesson to a modern priest. Their self-denial and the strictness of their personal lives, added to their remarkable humility and obliteration of self, often indicated great holiness, but it was of a stamp which an outsider would not easily grasp. They themselves in their daily conversations made light of their labours, and it was considered almost bad manners to talk of spiritual matters. All that was taken as a matter of course, and anyone who spoke of it would be suspected of self-consciousness. The concealment of their devotional life had become to them a second nature, and it is no wonder that the converts who were

brought up under such different surroundings failed to appreciate the real substantial virtues of a priest of the old school or even failed to believe in their existence."

He had grown up surrounded by memories of the Oxford Movement, all its leaders were familiar to him. But at Old Hall he had learned to know—to love the traditions of the Old English Catholics, to realize the depths of their unostentatious piety, the solidity of their worth. They had not been in the habit of writing about themselves or their aims or ideals. The Oxford converts had told their story. The restoration of the Hierarchy had seemed to them the beginning of the Catholic Church in this country. But as Mgr. Ward sat in the President's Room at Old Hall once occupied by Stapleton and Poynter, Griffiths and Weathers, turning over their letters, and as day by day he passed by their tombs he realized what a grievous injustice was being done to men who had borne the burdens and heats of the day under most depressing circumstances.

The Archbishops and Bishops of modern times have entered upon the enjoyment of the fruits of the long labours of the Vicars-Apostolic. Mgr. Ward set out to right an injustice when he wrote the history of English Catholics from 1781 to 1850. Dr. Burton's "Life of Bishop Challoner" gave him at once a starting-point and a stimulus to his work. It was not until he was over fifty years of age that he even thought of undertaking the great work which will keep his name alive long after many of his other activities are forgotten—those seven volumes are a great historical achievement. Within nine years he made the necessary original researches, digested and arranged the matter and wrote the entire work—all in time snatched from other onerous duties.

That historical triumph was in great measure due to his whole-hearted devotion and humility. He made no claim to literary ability, or to critical brilliancy. And yet the structure of the five early volumes reveals an unsuspected power of marshalling the details of many a tangled situation, a keen insight into the characters of men, and the possession of a vivid faculty for resuscitating the dead past. No less remarkable are the subdivisions of the long range of years, the grouping of the chapters, the unfailing instinct in selecting the climax of a chapter and of a volume, and leading up to it quite

naturally; a dramatic gift which would have made the fortune of many a novelist.

None who were in contact with Mgr. Ward could fail to be impressed by his simple, solid piety. He was a man who knew his own mind, he had a strong character, what he set out to do was done. As a man he called forth intense loyalty and sometimes active dislike: you could not be indifferent. But clash of temperaments, conflict of policies, natural antipathies ought not to obscure in our minds the real greatness of the man. What he did, he did to please God. Many misunderstood his reticences. He rarely thanked his colleagues for the work they were doing. He would have felt it an impertinence on his part: after all, they were working to please God even as he was. But his loyalty to his friends knew no limits.

His spiritual conferences to the Church boys in earlier days, to the Divines in later days, were impressive because of his obvious sincerity: the form received little attention, the matter was solid, the argument was backed up by the practical example of his prayerfulness, self-denial and regularity. The exactitude and punctuality with which he followed the time-table of the College remains a living and stimulating influence in the lives of scores of priests: Meditation, Mass, Thanksgiving, Spiritual Reading, Rosary and Visit were never omitted. If he foresaw the day was to be a busy one he rose an hour earlier and kept to his programme. And yet, in spite of appearances, the margin of health on which he worked, was narrow. The key to not a little of Mgr. Ward's life is given in his discourse, Nov. 6th, 1902, on his saintly guide and adviser, Dr. Robert Butler: "Since I first knew him in the early days of my priesthood, I have never spent a day without thinking of him, never had to face any trial or difficulty such as by God's Providence we have to face in this world without knowing that there was a man of God to whom to appeal, ever ready to give his whole mind and his whole sympathy . . . the one thought which I would put before you is that which has always appeared to me the keynote of his life: the true and real joy, the unintermittant joy of the service of God. 'We make our own sorrows by our want of faith,' he would say. 'God sends us trials, yes; sufferings, yes. Ought we not to

rejoice when He does so? Are they not the very means of our sanctification? But throughout all our life it is God's will that there should be a continual current of joy—that there should not be one moment of real sorrow. Confidence in God is what we want.' He never spoke of his relations, for he had given himself to the ministry and had gone forth as one without home or friends to fulfil the evangelical counsels in all their fullness. Detachment was complete; yet not the detachment of one who suppressed his human feelings, but of one who raised and sanctified them. He would often quote the great Jesuit saint who would make his daily offering to God: 'I offer my brethren in religion with one hand and my relations with the other, before the throne of God.' They were indeed constantly in his thoughts and were to him more—much more—than to many who show it more. Yet externally there was the perfect detachment necessary for the work of his life."

"*To fulfil the evangelical counsels in all their fullness—the perfect detachment necessary for the work of his life.*" Without meaning to do so Mgr. Ward, in 1902, was formulating the guiding principles of his life, set out more fully in his work: *Priestly Vocation*, in 1918—exemplified in the daily living of his life to those who could see. Poverty, Chastity, Obedience were for him the essence of his priestly life: his book embodies no mere theories, but his own practice.

Those who knew him were familiar with the bareness of his room, the meagreness of his wardrobe. Little by little his personal treasures vanished, gifts were passed on, the gold watch replaced by a gun-metal one—until at last there remained one pathetic object which he kept to the end: his M.C.C. cap. Books were bought for use, when their purpose had been achieved, they went to the Library or to a student or priest who might be interested.

His gifts to the poor are known to God alone. Where he could be of use to others he was lavish in expenditure, but he grudged anything spent on himself without necessity. Throughout his Presidency his summer holidays were reduced to a minimum: two or three weeks preferably in Switzerland, generally in the company of Dr. Burton. When he went on such holidays he took with him a couple of students who travelled at his expense.

He appreciated good food, but at home never paid the slightest attention to what was placed before him—roast beef and rice pudding would satisfy him from one year's end to the other—yet it gave him great joy to initiate young men in the newly-started continental dining-car, in foreign food, and ways and scenes. Rarely, however, was his holiday separated from a pilgrimage to some Catholic centre of devotion : no visit to Switzerland was possible without a few days at Einsiedeln; if he were in France he would go hundreds of miles out of his way so as not to miss visiting Lourdes; in Italy Loreto and Genezzano were chosen places of prayers whenever opportunity offered. His devotion to Our Lady was intense, but his reticence was typical of Old English Catholic tradition. Speaking of the poverty of the priest, he says : " The life of the secular priest may be full of care and anxiety on the question of money—difficulty of making ends meet, support of church and school, perhaps the weight of a capital debt, good works languishing for want of means—the poor dependent on him—and so forth. He will wear a threadbare coat, and deny himself any food or comfort that are not absolutely necessary, for the sake of his people and his work . . . Our life must have about it the notes and characteristics of the poor men that we are. It must be a life of humility and self-effacement, hardiness, and of work; there must be no self-indulgence; and, above all, we must surrender our liberty to the call of duty . . ." (pp. 28-29).

That was the real life of Bernard Ward : his attempt to make his own Dr. Butler's lesson of " the perfect detachment necessary for the work of his life ". It was of him, too, that he said : " there have been those who failed to understand him, who have spoken of him lightly and even uncharitably—so far as he was concerned, we thank God for it. He would not have been the saint he was had he not had a share in the ingratitude of the world."

With all his spirit of resignation and detachment, Bernard Ward had that intense sensitiveness which had characterized his father. The bluff and hearty manner, the abrupt and almost brutal firmness of not a few of his decisions, the downright vigour with which he would carry out what he conceived his duty demanded—hid from the eyes of most men and even of those who worked

with him, that he was a man very conscious of his weakness and of his shortcomings.

In his Funeral Sermon, Dr. Burton, his former Vice-President, spoke of what he knew: "It fell to me to be with him through many trials, and this was one part of his spiritual life of which he would readily speak, but always to lament his failure to live up to his own ideal of resignation. All men have failings of which they are conscious, and other failings, possibly even more obvious, which they fail to recognize. He judged himself with severity on this point, and often was full of self-reproach while I was touched with admiration for him. For I think there was more suffering, mental and physical, in his life than most men knew; and it was not easy for him to suffer. Though few suspected it, he was by nature very sensitive and easily hurt, even when no injury was meant. Then, in spite of his robust appearance, his health was always very precarious and induced moods of depression which laid strong hold on a temperament naturally apprehensive. These trials, in addition to the actual anxieties and responsibilities of life, caused him a great deal of very real suffering, in which he could only find relief in submission to the will of God, and in his deeply-rooted conviction that such crosses were for the good of the soul. 'To the work of Thy hands Thou shalt stretch out Thy right hand'—and he recognized the divine touch of chastisement and healing."

Crosses known to all were not spared him. In 1907 his name was mentioned in connection with the vacant see of Northampton. His heart and soul were in St. Edmund's College. The prospect of being uprooted from the spot in which he had taken such deep root filled him with deep concern. He prepared for the parting. The news of the appointment was published. Hundreds of congratulations were showered upon him. Then came the announcement that the new Bishop was to be Dr. Keating. His sadness at the prospect of leaving Old Hall, and his apprehension of new difficulties ahead, seemed, humanly speaking, thrown away, and all the publicity surrounding the event constituted a trial which was no easy one to bear.

The outbreak of the War affected him most deeply. From the first and throughout he took a pessimistic view of the War and of its consequences. Unfortunately,



his judgment has been more than justified—his quiet but deep patriotism suffered acutely as the War was prolonged, and the news of the deaths of so many of his old boys reached him. His eldest brother, Granville, died on September 2nd, 1915. On October 28th, 1915, Dr. Burton, who had been Vice-President since 1902, was taken seriously ill. Although they were not aware of it at the time, that was the end of the long Ward-Burton co-operation. They never renewed their intimacy, and in fact rarely ever met.

Mgr. Ward himself was taken seriously ill on November 16th, 1915. Both President and Vice-President left the College about the middle of December: Dr. Burton only to return as President in August, 1916, Mgr. Ward to return on Shrove Tuesday. To the end he shrank from the wrench of leaving the College, as was natural, and suffered acutely when the time of departure arrived. With absolute singleness of purpose he had given himself and all that he had to become God's priest, and God had accepted the sacrifice and by a succession of blows completed the detachment of Bernard Ward from practically all he had continued to treasure on earth.

In this brief sketch our concern is not so much with what Bernard Ward *did* either as Priest or Bishop, as with what he *was* and what he *strove to be*. The example of his daily life, even as only known on the surface, has been a source of inspiration to hundreds of priests and laymen who came within the range of his influence. Essentially a man of God he did his best to lead men to God. His brief Episcopate was marked by the same devotion to the realization of the priestly ideal in those he was called upon to rule as had characterized his earlier life. And the response of his Clergy to one who appreciated the difficulties they had to face was a last joy granted by God to a faithful servant.

## RESERVED CASES

BY THE REV. E. J. MAHONEY, D.D.

### INTRODUCTORY.

A discussion, reduced to practical limits, concerning reserved cases in the internal forum of Penance. Reservation a legitimate restriction of jurisdiction.

#### I.

RESERVATIONS "PROPTER PECCATUM." Fewness of these cases. Ignorance of reservation ~~on the part of the penitent.~~

#### II.

THE INCURRING OF CENSURE. Notion of Censure. Kinds. Conditions for Incurring. Ignorance commonly excuses. *Benigna est interpretatio facienda.* Censures *nemini reservatae.*

#### III.

RESERVATIONS "PROPTER CENSURAM." Interpretation of Faculties *pagella.* Reserved Excommunications in the general law of the Code. Further reservation made by Ordinaries.

### CONCLUSION.

Summary indication of the procedure for absolving reserved cases. Relations between the internal and the external forum.

Many of us have the feeling of navigating an uncharted sea whenever we are confronted with what appears to be a reserved case. This is not surprising for the subject is an intricate one and causes perplexity, at times, even to expert canonists and theologians. The obscure and confused impression left on the mind, after trying to understand a treatise on the subject, is due to the mass of detail crowded into the ordinary manual. Excommunications, Interdicts, Suspensions, reservations "ab homine," reservations "specialissimo modo," "speciali modo," "simpliciter," etc., etc., present the aspect of a jig-saw puzzle. It affects differently various minds. Some few arrive at the conclusion that the subject is almost beyond human ken. *Ad impossibile nemo tenetur.* They absolve everybody and everything, *urbi et orbi* as it were. At the other extreme are the excellent persons who have a list of about forty cases pinned up in the confessional, including crimes such as appealing from the Pope to a General Council and forging papal briefs. They detect reserved cases on the slightest provocation and are continually corresponding with the Vicar General to obtain faculties *ad cautelam*, especially for everything which has the scent of heresy.

I think it should be possible to steer a safe course between these two extremes, by regarding the subject from a practical point of view and eliminating altogether the rare situations which, if they arise at all, may be left to the episcopal curia to unravel. In approaching the subject in this way there is a danger of securing simplicity at the cost of accuracy. There is also a danger of offering elementary and commonplace information with which all the clergy are perfectly familiar. It is hoped that both these inconveniences will be avoided and that the very familiar phrase from the Common of Confessors may be used as a guiding principle: "*expositio ita nescientibus fiat cognita, ut tamen scientibus non sit onerosa.*"

At the basis of the whole question is the doctrine that, in addition to priestly ordination, a confessor requires jurisdiction over a penitent. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction is more easily recognized when it is exercised publicly and externally, for example, when a convert is reconciled to the Church. But every sacramental absolution granted to every penitent in the confessional is an exercise of jurisdiction on the part of the confessor and is subject to much the same rules as jurisdiction in the external forum, though it is restricted entirely to the forum of conscience and is used under a seal of the most sacred secrecy. The distinction between the internal forum of conscience and the external forum of ecclesiastical law is an important one and we shall have to return to it. For the moment it must be remembered that the confessor's power is restricted entirely to the internal forum, as every "*pagella*" of faculties carefully notes. It is concerned with the private good of the individual, whereas jurisdiction in the external forum has in view the public well-being of the whole Christian community.

The Church is a monarchical institution and jurisdiction is enjoyed, in varying degrees, by different grades of the hierarchy. It may be limited territorially, limited to certain subjects, or for a certain time. It may also be limited with regard to certain cases, owing to the fact that a superior authority has withdrawn their absolution to his own tribunal, and it is this withdrawal of jurisdiction which creates the reserved case. It is an entire misconception to regard reservation as an ecclesiastical practice depriving the confessor of powers which really belong to him, as it were, by native right. For the practice is merely an instance of the graduated jurisdiction which is exercised in the Church, the jurisdiction of the Pope alone being unlimited. "It is of the highest importance for Christian discipline that the graver and more serious crimes should not be absolved by all priests, but only by those in higher authority. Hence, the Sovereign Pontiffs, by reason of their supreme power over the Universal Church, are accustomed to reserve the more grievous cases to their own judgment. The same power is lawfully used by each Bishop in his own diocese . . . especially as regards those crimes to which the

censure of excommunication is attached."<sup>1</sup> Reservation, therefore, as the Council of Trent indicates, may happen in various ways: some cases are reserved to the Holy See, others to the Ordinary; some are reserved because a censure of excommunication is attached to them, others are reserved without a censure. It will be found, on examination, that the majority of cases over which a confessor has no jurisdiction are carefully determined, both as to the case and as to the authority to whom they are reserved, by the common law of the Church as set out in the Code. But, in addition to these cases, Ordinaries may, within certain limits, reserve further cases to themselves.<sup>2</sup>

*\* not always* This radical power is ~~sometimes never~~ used, but a correct understanding of reservation is impossible unless it is remembered. Whatever unusual obscurity and difficulty exists in this matter is due to the double authority to whom cases may be reserved, the Holy See and Ordinaries; it is due still more to the double method of reservation technically described as *propter censuram* and *propter peccatum*.

A priest hearing a penitent accuse himself of a sin which he suspects is reserved will deal with it correctly by turning over in his mind the following questions: Is the sin reserved without a censure? If there is a censure, has the penitent actually incurred it? Is the censure that has been incurred reserved to a higher tribunal? If the case is certainly reserved, whether *propter peccatum* or *propter censuram*, what procedure must be followed in securing its absolution? I propose to discuss the first three of these questions and to deal only indirectly and in a very summary manner with the last one, for the space at my disposal does not permit me to comment upon it adequately.<sup>3</sup>

### I.

The confessor detects, let us suppose, that the case is reserved without a censure, a situation described variously by the authors as *casus reservatus sine censura*, *peccatum reservatum ratione sui*, *casus reservatus propter peccatum*. It belongs to a very small class—the great majority of reserved cases being *propter censuram*—and includes the one sin reserved to the Holy See and whatever further cases an Ordinary may reserve to himself.<sup>4</sup> Before reserving any cases, the Ordinary is required to discuss the matter in a diocesan Synod or to consult his Chapter and

<sup>1</sup> Council of Trent *Sess. xiv. cap. vii.*

<sup>2</sup> Can. 893, §1.

<sup>3</sup> EDITOR'S NOTE. If the subject proves of interest to the clergy, the author will contribute a further article, in a subsequent number of the REVIEW, on the absolution of reserved cases.

<sup>4</sup> The papal case, false accusation of a confessor, Can. 894, is also reserved *propter censuram*, Can. 2363, and is the only example of two-fold reservation in the general law of the Church. Regular superiors may also reserve cases affecting their subjects, Can. 896, but any confessor approved by the local Ordinary may absolve them. Can. 519.

some experienced confessors.<sup>5</sup> The cases reserved must not exceed four grave, external, specific crimes, and should not include cases which are already punished by a censure, whether reserved or not.<sup>6</sup> Ordinaries quite often do not use to their full extent the powers they possess, but the sacerdotal crime of abusing the confessional is nearly always reserved, in every diocese, because it does not happen to be visited by a censure *latae sententiae*, although it is punished most severely in every other way.<sup>7</sup> In many places wilful murder is also reserved, but an accurate list of the four episcopal cases can be compiled only by consulting the *pagella* of Faculties in each diocese. Episcopal reservations of this kind are usually mentioned under the general heading "casus."

The effect of a reservation *propter peccatum* is that the confessor's power of absolving that sin is withdrawn, whereas in the cases reserved *propter censuram* his power cannot be used solely because the censure forbids the reception of the Sacrament of Penance. Once the censure is removed any confessor may absolve from the sin. The law regarding the absolution of reserved censures by a priest who is ignorant of their reservation is very indulgent,<sup>8</sup> but the unwitting absolution of a reservation *propter peccatum* by a confessor without faculties leaves the penitent, theoretically at least, under the obligation of submitting the sin again to a privileged confessor. The position and obligation of this penitent are exactly similar to the case of one who has forgotten to confess a mortal sin; he is in a state of grace, other things being equal, since it is impossible to have one mortal sin remitted without the rest, but he is bound, if he is aware of the defect to submit the sin for direct absolution.<sup>9</sup>

Before deciding that a penitent is burdened with a reserved sin certain conditions must be verified: the reservation must be quite certain; the sin must be grave, external and consummated; and it must be exactly and specifically that sin which is

<sup>5</sup> Can. 895.

<sup>6</sup> Can. 897, 898.

<sup>7</sup> De Smet, *De Absolutione complicitis et Sollicitatione*, n. 115; Can. 904: 2368; *Documentum V* at the end of the Codex Juris.

<sup>8</sup> Can. 2247, §3.

<sup>9</sup> The difference between the two categories of reservations is well put by D'Annibale: Etenim absolutio a peccatis ad Deum nobis reconciliandum, absolutio a censuris ad restituendum ea quae propria sunt civium Ecclesiae militantis. . . . Illa non nisi contritis et volentibus dari potest haec valide datur etiam contumacibus, et invitis. Illa pure danda est; haec dari potest sub conditione, et ex die vel in diem; illa, quia est pars sacramenti, praesentibus tantum; haec et absentibus recte datur: illa metu extorta valet, haec non item; illa reservatis nedum directe, sed et indirecte ex justa causa dari potest; haec non nisi directe. Coeterum, altera seorsim ab altera datur valide: nempe absolutio a censuris sine absolutione a peccatis semper et directe datur; absolutio a peccatis, non absolutis censuris, solum indirecte, et sum poenitens eam recipit in bona fide et ceteris paribus. Cardinal D'Annibale *In Constitutionem Apostolicam Sedis*, §227.

reserved. It is still, to some extent, disputed whether, granted that these points are verified, the penitent is not to be regarded as having a reserved sin unless he knew, at the time of its commission, that it was reserved. The opinion that ignorance does not excuse is nowadays commonly held,<sup>10</sup> and has everything in its favour, because reservation is a limitation of the confessor's powers rather than a medicinal measure for the prevention of sin. It is, therefore, immaterial whether a penitent is unaware of the reservation, unless the reserving authority expressly states that ignorance excuses.<sup>11</sup>

## II.

It has been necessary to discuss reservations *propter peccatum*, in order to have a clear idea of the whole question. As a matter of fact, however, the majority of reserved cases are reservations *propter censuram*, i.e., the penalty attached to the sin is reserved.

The power of inflicting punishment in order to secure the observance of law is a necessary feature of all legislation, and the spiritual penalties of the Church are, as the Council of Trent declares, the very sinews of ecclesiastical discipline.<sup>12</sup> The common good sometimes demands the punishment of the offender, and those ecclesiastical penalties which have in view chiefly the vindication of justice are called *poenae vindicativae*.<sup>13</sup> With these we are not concerned. Other penalties have in view chiefly the amendment and betterment of the delinquent, a cure for his ills rather than a public vindication of justice. These medicinal penalties are *censures* and, when their absolution is reserved to a higher authority, the sin to which they are attached becomes reserved *propter censuram*. A correct understanding of the matter is of great importance for the confessor, because he can form the judgment quite often that, although a grave sin has been committed, the censure has not been incurred, in which case the sin can be absolved like any other, and there is generally no need to seek special faculties to deal with it.

A censure is an ecclesiastical penalty incurred by a delinquent and contumacious person, depriving him of certain goods, chiefly of a spiritual nature, until he has ceased to be contumacious and is absolved from the penalty.<sup>14</sup> ~~He is contumacious when he has committed some crime knowing that a censure is attached to it.~~ The principal and immediate

<sup>10</sup> Cappello, *De Penitentia*, §537; Vermeerch, *Theologia Moralis* III., §463; Aertneys, *Theologia Moralis* II., §389.

<sup>11</sup> The opposite and milder view is that ignorance of reservation excuses is nevertheless held by a few authors. Cf. Farrugia, *De Casuum Conscientiae Reservationibus*, §11.

<sup>12</sup> *Sess. xiv. De Ref.* cap. 3.

<sup>13</sup> Cann. 2286-2305.

<sup>14</sup> Cann. 2215; 2241, §1.



purpose of a censure being medicinal, the delinquent is entitled to absolution once he has repented of his crime and undertaken to perform due satisfaction.<sup>15</sup>

Censures differ in species according to the nature and extent of the deprivation. Thus *Suspension* forbids a cleric to use the powers of his Order or Office. *Interdict* is a censure by which persons, while retaining communication with the faithful, are denied the use of certain specified sacred things. But the most serious censure and the one most commonly used is *Excommunication*, which deprives a person of communication with the faithful in all those spiritual goods which are within the competence of the Church to control, e.g., the reception of the sacraments. The Church cannot, of course, deprive anyone of those spiritual things which depend entirely on the personal relations between a soul and God, such as sanctifying Grace. It is the censure of Excommunication which has the closest connection with our subject, for Suspension does not, and Interdict need not, necessarily, deprive a delinquent of the Sacraments. An excommunicated person can receive the Sacraments validly, *ceteris paribus*, but the action is gravely unlawful and the ministering priest is liable to serious penalties. In order to keep the matter within practical and manageable limits, whenever we speak of a case being reserved *propter censuram*, we mean a censure which deprives a delinquent of the use of the Sacraments, and this, for practical purposes and in the majority of cases, is the censure of Excommunication.

There are various methods by which censures may be incurred, and we must mention them in order to eliminate the rare and unusual types which will scarcely ever come within the ordinary parochial administration of the sacraments. A censure is *latae sententiae* if incurred *ipso facto* by committing the crime to which it is attached. It is *ferendae sententiae* if it is inflicted *post factum* by a superior authority. It is *ab homine* if attached to a particular precept placed upon an individual or if it is inflicted upon an individual by a condemnatory sentence. In many particulars the full effects of a censure *latae sententiae* do not follow until it is judicially declared to have been incurred. Now, within the limited scope of this discussion, it will not be necessary to deal with censures *ab homine*, nor with those that are *ferendae sententiae*, nor with declaratory and condemnatory sentences. Many bishops rule their dioceses for years without having to inflict censures in any of these ways. It will be sufficient for us to confine our attention to those censures which are incurred simply *latae sententiae*, for it is precisely these, whether reserved or not, that are likely to be met with in the administration of the Sacrament of Penance.

*The confessor who is called upon to deal with a case to which a censure is attached must first decide whether the censure has*

<sup>15</sup> Can. 2242, §3; 2248, §2.

been incurred. Certain well-defined conditions are required in the crime committed and in the person committing it, and a careful enquiry into this aspect of the matter must obviously precede any subsequent decision as to whether the censure is reserved, and, if so, whether immediate absolution is justified and under what conditions. No censure can be incurred unless the crime is certainly a grave, external, consummated sin, committed with that degree of imputability required by the law.<sup>16</sup> Whatever excuses a person from the guilt of mortal sin, for example, smallness of matter or imperfect consent due to ignorance or fear, automatically excuses him from incurring a censure. The crime must be an external one, because no external legal penalty can be attached to a purely internal act. A person could commit a grave sin of heresy by thought, but he incurs no censure until he speaks or writes heresy. The crime must be exactly and specifically that which is defined in the wording of the law,<sup>17</sup> for a censure is an onerous thing requiring strict legal interpretation, and is not incurred unless an act is consummated in the sense the law determines. Lastly, a censure is not incurred unless the crime has been committed with that degree of imputability or responsibility which the law requires, for, unless this is present, the person committing the crime may be a grave sinner but he is not contumacious. Thus, young people who have not reached the age of puberty, can commit grave sin but they are excused from incurring censures.<sup>18</sup> *latae sententiae*

The question of penal imputability is not easy to understand, but a closer definition is essential for a correct explanation of censures. The issue may be put simply in this way. Whatever excuses a person from mortal sin excuses him from censure, but the degree of responsibility required by the moral law for grave sin is not identical with that required by positive ecclesiastical law for incurring censures. For example, fear, ignorance or negligence, may excuse a person from moral responsibility for actions committed under their influence. On the other hand, they may not excuse owing to the fact that the resulting action was voluntary in its cause. This is the ordinary doctrine of the moral theologians. The confessor has merely to decide whether, on the accepted principles, an act committed through negligence, ignorance or fear is to be reckoned gravely culpable in all the circumstances. If the answer is negative no censure is incurred. But if the answer is affirmative a further enquiry is necessary before it can be decided with certainty that the person is censured. It must be determined whether an action, which is morally imputable as a grave sin, is also penally imputable as a contumacious act. The point can be settled to

<sup>16</sup> Can. 2242.

<sup>17</sup> Can. 2228.

<sup>18</sup> Can. 2230. The age of puberty is fourteen for males and twelve for females (Can. 88, §2) but, in applying this notion to ~~the penal law~~, the age of fourteen is commonly admitted for both sexes. *Apollinaris*, 1931, p. 142; Can. 1648, §3. *Censures latae sententiae*

some extent by taking into account the terms used in the wording of various censures. If the law contains words such as "consulto" "studiose" "scienter" "ausus fuerit," words which imply the fullest knowledge and deliberation, any diminution of imputability whatever, whether on the part of the intellect or of the will, excuses from censure, even though the action is gravely sinful. The terms of Canon 2229 sanction a liberal interpretation of this rule.

A principle fully discussed by the authors "De Actibus Humanis" is that ignorance may lessen or even eliminate moral responsibility. Therefore, as a necessary conclusion from what has already been said, invincible ignorance of the law excuses from censure, because it excuses from grave sin. This principle of natural ethics is applied by ecclesiastical law to invincible ignorance not only of the law but of the censure attached. It has no reference, of course, to ignorance of the *reservation* of a censure. A decision in a given case is scarcely capable of mathematical precision. The confessor must decide whether, in all the circumstances of a person's education and position, his ignorance of the censure can be described as invincible and inculpable. Inculpable ignorance in a layman might easily be gravely culpable in a priest. The worst sort consists in electing to remain ignorant in order that the law may be broken with greater impunity. This is "affected ignorance" and never excuses from censures, not even from those containing such words as "scienter."<sup>19</sup> However, culpable ignorance is not usually of this virulent type, directly cultivated. It is usually due to negligence in acquiring information, and the enquiry turns upon determining the degree of negligence and resulting ignorance. Since a censure is a medicinal punishment inflicted chiefly as a deterrent from certain crimes, we are not surprised to find that the Church indulgently excuses from censure, on the score of ignorance, even those delinquents who are guilty of grave negligence in being unaware of the existence of a law or of its penalty. The ignorance is gravely culpable and there may be grave sin, but no censure is incurred. But there is a type of culpable ignorance so grossly inexcusable that it is called "crass" or "supine," implying that no trouble whatever has been taken to acquire the necessary knowledge. With regard to this kind of ignorance, the verbal expression of censures must be taken into account. For even crass ignorance excuses one from incurring those censures which contain such expressions as "scienter," etc., but it does not excuse from the rest.

It must be admitted that this part of our subject is extremely involved, but the practical application of the law can be seen from an examination of the wording of the very familiar and common censures of Can. 2319. Any legal system must necessarily

<sup>19</sup> It is interesting to note that Can 2229, §1 supports the doctrine of St. Thomas (1-11 76, 4), from which some authors dissent, that affected ignorance increases responsibility.

contain similar interpretations of verbal terminology. The stress which has been placed on everything that excuses from censure is an application of the all-embracing rule of Cann. 19 and 2219 §1, namely that the interpretation of the law must err on the side of the delinquent: *in poenis benigna est interpretatio facienda*. If there is any reasonable doubt concerning the terms of the law or whether the delinquent is excused, the doubt is to be settled in favour of the penitent not in favour of the law.<sup>20</sup> Ignorance of a censure is the commonest of all excuses that can be pleaded. It does not follow that no one can ever incur a censure *latae sententiae* except those skilled in Canon Law. Ignorance of a censure being attached to a law is rarely culpable in lay people, but it is a spiritual weapon that can be used when necessary. Catholics who are educating their children in heresy, for example, or who have become freemasons, should be warned of the penalty. If they persist in violation of the law, with knowledge of the censure, they are contumacious and incur excommunication beyond any doubt whatever. Similarly, persons who commit abortion may escape the penalty the first time, through ignorance of its existence, but the priest who absolves the sin will warn them of the censure they will certainly incur if the crime is repeated. In these examples the censure as a medicinal penalty is clearly portrayed.

A censure cannot be absolved until the penitent satisfies whatever conditions the law imposes *injunctis de jure injungendis*. If these requirements are complied with quite a number of censures may be absolved<sup>\*</sup> without any special faculty. They are the censures *nemini reservatae*.<sup>21</sup> Others are reserved and present some further problems.

### III.

Adequate knowledge of a confessor's powers over reserved cases can be obtained by comparing the pagella of faculties with the printed lists of reserved censures. The formula of the pagella in the section devoted to the Sacrament of Penance contains a more or less extensive grant over certain cases which are reserved in the Code to the Holy See or to Ordinaries. Those reserved to the Holy See are divided into three categories, chiefly with a view to avoiding an unwieldy repetition of cases in conceding faculties. The Ordinary usually has no power to sub-delegate the faculties he may himself possess over censures reserved to the Holy See "specialissimo" or "speciali modo." But he may, if he wishes, sub-delegate confessors to absolve from papal "simpliciter" cases, provided they are occult. Therefore, even though the fact is hardly ever expressly

<sup>20</sup> Can. 15; 2228.

<sup>21</sup> Editing the Holy Scriptures without permission: 2318. Giving ecclesiastical burial in cases where it is forbidden: 2339; Alienating ecclesiastical goods: 2347; Compelling persons to enter the ecclesiastical or religious state: 2352; Refusing to denounce a priest who has abused the confessional: 2368.

\*  
in the internal  
forum

mentioned in the *pagella*, the confessor must take it for granted that he has no power over any cases reserved to the Holy See, beyond those expressly mentioned. The formula usually states that, with certain exceptions, faculties are given over cases reserved "simpliciter" to the Holy See, provided they are occult, and over cases reserved to the Ordinary. A superficial reading of the formula might lead the confessor to suppose that he can absolve *all* reserved censures, apart from the short list of exceptions. This would be a lamentably erroneous conclusion, for he has no power over the six cases reserved "*specialissimo modo*," the eleven reserved "*speciali modo*" and the eleven reserved "*simpliciter*" if they are public.

The next thing to note in the *pagella* is whether there are any other cases reserved by the Ordinary to himself, in addition to those reserved to him by the general law of the Code. Occasionally they are included in the list of exceptions already mentioned, but the better and clearer method determines these additional cases in a separate phrase, e.g.: "*Facultates tribuimus absolvendi a censuris, vel, dummodo casus fuerint occulti, ipsi Sedi Apostolicae simpliciter reservatis, exceptis sequentibus, scilicet. . . . Insuper Nobis reservamus sequentes casus, scilicet. . . .*" The interpretation of these additional cases may cause some little difficulty. Cases reserved to the Ordinary by the general law of the Code are all *propter censuram*, but the additional ones reserved by the Ordinary to himself are usually *propter peccatum*, even though they are expressed under the general term "*casus*." But there is no reason why the Ordinary should not attach censures to certain crimes and reserve them to himself *propter censuram*, although this is rarely done in practice.<sup>22</sup> It may also happen that, in a given Province, there exists some censure reserved to the Ordinary by Provincial Law. A reference to this under the term "*casus*" must be held to refer to the censure.

A complete list of the reserved censures, in the general law of the Code, may be found in any manual "*De Censuris*," and a summary indication of each one is given below<sup>23</sup> for the

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Cann. 2214, 2246, §1, 2247, §1. These additional episcopal reservations *propter censuram*, are included in the terms of Can. 899, §3: *a casibus quos quoque modo sibi Ordinarii reservaverint*, etc. Cf. Farrugia *De Casuum Conscientiae Reservatione*, §27.

<sup>23</sup> EXCOMMUNICATION RESERVED TO THE HOLY SEE.

#### SPECIALISSIMO MODO.

Desecrating the Holy Eucharist. 2320.

Striking the Pope. 2343.

Absolving an accomplice. 2367.

Violating the Seal. 2369.

Violating the secret of a Papal Conclave (Constitution *Vacante Sede*. Dec. 25, 1904. n. 51).

Violating the secret of episcopal promotions (S.C. Consist. April 25, 1917. Gasparri *Fontes* V, 2096).

convenience of the reader. In the Code they are not arranged in groups, but occur under the appropriate section of the law. Thus Canon 2343 sets out the law protecting ecclesiastics from physical violence, and the censure is reserved in different classes according to the dignity of the person attacked.

I have not introduced Interdicts and Suspensions into this discussion and, consequently, have not included them in the lists. More often than not these penalties are *poenae vindicativae* rather than censures. In addition to the Suspensions in the general law of the Code, which are chiefly attached to the unlawful reception or administration of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, we have in England the Suspension (a censure) imposed by the IVth Provincial Council of Westminster, which is reserved to the Ordinary of the suspended cleric.

\* \* \* \*

Familiarity with the lists of reservations, with the pagella of faculties and with the terms of Canons 899, 900, 2229 and 2254 will enable confessors to deal accurately with reserved

#### *SPECIALI MODO.*

Apostasy, Heresy, and Schism. 2314.  
Suspicion of Heresy. 2315.  
Printing, reading, retaining prohibited books. 2318.  
Simulating Mass or Absolution. 2322.  
Appealing from the Pope to a General Council. 2332.  
Impeding the execution of Papal Briefs. 2333.  
Impeding the liberties of the Church. 2334.  
Citing highly placed ecclesiastics before a civil court. 2341.  
Striking the same. 2343.  
Usurping the rights of the Roman Church. 2345.  
Forging Papal Briefs. 2360.  
False accusation of a Confessor. 2363.

#### *SIMPLICITER.*

Trafficking in Indulgences. 2327.  
Joining Freemasons and other forbidden societies. 2335.  
Absolving without faculties censures reserved "specialissimo or speciali modo." 2338.  
Unlawfully assisting and "excommunicatus vitandus." 2338.  
Citing ecclesiastical superiors before a civil court. 2341.  
Violating a religious enclosure. 2342.  
Usurping ecclesiastical goods. 2346.  
Duelling. 2351.  
Attempted marriage by those in Major Orders or solemn vows. 2388.  
Simony. 2392.  
Forging episcopal documents. 2405.

#### EXCOMMUNICATIONS RESERVED TO THE ORDINARY.

Marriage before a non-Catholic minister. 2319, 1.  
Marrying with a pact to educate the children as non-Catholics. 2319, 2.  
Causing children to be baptised by non-Catholic ministers. 2319, 3.  
Educating children as non-Catholics. 2319, 4.  
Trafficking in false relics. 2326.  
Striking clerics or religious. 2343.  
Procuring abortion. 2350.  
Apostasy from religious Institutes. 2385.  
Marriage by those in simple vows. 2388.



cases. Those most likely to occur are lapses from Catholic Faith or Unity, e.g., marriage in a non-Catholic Church, and attacks on the rights and property of the Church. Abortion, more often than not, is conceded in diocesan faculties. The remainder are chiefly crimes committed by clerics and religious.

The confessor decides first whether the case is reserved *propter peccatum* and extensive faculties are given under Canons 899 §3 and 900. Usually the reservation will be *propter censuram*, in which case the delinquent is often excused through ignorance of the censure. If the censure has actually been incurred, the pagella may contain delegated faculties to absolve it, failing which the confessor may be able to absolve it under Canon 2254. If Canons 900 and 2254 are not applicable, the penitent must either approach a privileged confessor or return after a suitable interval, during which time the priest will obtain the necessary faculty.

From the nature of a censure, which is a medicinal penalty inflicted for some *external* crime, it follows that every censured person is liable to be required to receive absolution in the external forum. The Church, in modern times, is accustomed to tolerate absolution in the internal forum alone always in occult cases, sometimes even in public cases. This indulgent attitude is, however, conditioned in the following way. Unless there is proof or a lawful presumption that absolution has been obtained, the superior of the external forum, e.g., the Ordinary, can always insist on absolution being given externally.<sup>24</sup> It is a matter which must clearly be left to those who hold authority in the external forum. Cases might arise in which a person's actions, for example, the open profession of heresy, are held to have incurred censure. In the internal forum of conscience the person may be excused, for some of the reasons discussed above, or may have been absolved secretly in the internal forum, under the seal of confession. Ecclesiastical authority may, nevertheless, require absolution even in the external forum, for if a person breaks the law externally his guilt is presumed, in the external forum, until the contrary is established.<sup>25</sup> Therefore, the Church universally requires converts from heretical sects to be absolved in the external forum, even though their heresy was merely material and accompanied by no formal guilt. If this rule, regulating the relations between the internal and external forum, is remembered, the practice of different dioceses in reconciling lapsed Catholics is easily explained. It is not that the law of the Church is observed in some places and not in others, but simply that the competent authorities in some places use, for good reasons, their undoubted prerogative, whereas, in other places, for equally good reasons, this right is not exercised.

<sup>24</sup> Can. 2251.

<sup>25</sup> Can. 2200, §2.

## HOMILETICS

BY THE VERY REV. A. CANON VILLIERS.

*The following notes are meant to set out the dogmatic teachings of the Gospels from Quinquagesima to the Third Sunday in Lent.*

### *Quinquagesima Sunday.*

#### *The Messianic Prophecies.*

"Behold we go up to Jerusalem and all things shall be accomplished which were spoken of by the Prophets concerning the Son of Man" Luke xviii. 31. Two sets of prophecies, one from the Old Testament the other from the New, are here referred to. The first contains the traditional testimony to the Passion of Christ spoken by the great teachers of the Jewish race; the second the testimony by Christ Himself concerning that same passion, death and resurrection before they came to pass.

#### *Unique Testimony.*

This traditional outlining of Christ's life recorded minutely in the Old Testament and reaching down from the Fall up to the Prophet Malachy, is without parallel in history.

By it Christ and He alone of all men lived in history before He was born into the world. Men knew when and where He was to appear, what He would do, how He would suffer and die, and rise again. Men knew all this as fully if not as voluminously as we to-day know the history of our heroes after they are themselves gone from us.

#### *The Testimony of the Prophets to the Passion, Death and Resurrection.*

Zachary: "that the Messiah should be delivered up and sold for thirty pieces of silver" Zach. xi. 13. David: that "He should be glutted with reproaches" Ps. xxi. Jeremias: "He should be buffeted" Lam. iii. 30. Isaias: "He shall be scourged and spat upon" Isaias l. 61. Again, Holy David: "They gave me gall for my food and in my thirst they gave me vinegar" Ps. lviii. 22; and again: "Thou wilt not leave His soul in hell, nor wilt thou give thy Holy One to see corruption" Ps. xv. 10.

#### *Prophecies by Christ Himself.*

The cross was always before Our Lord and He walked to it as a soldier to victory, so we find frequent references and prophecies concerning His crucifixion. But there are three notable occasions on which He openly declared it. Matt. xvi. 21-23 after the confession by St. Peter and the promise to him of the Primacy; second, when Christ and His Apostles were

together in Galilee after the Transfiguration, Matt. xvii. 21, 22; and, finally, on the way to Jerusalem, as reported by St. Luke in to-day's Gospel.

#### *Fathers.*

"Then it was He first announced it, but afterwards He showed it more fully by overwhelming circumstances. For what Jesus begins He ever perfects. But it was necessary that He should go up to Jerusalem so as to be slain in the Jerusalem which is here below that He might after His resurrection reign in the Heavenly Jerusalem" (Origen).

"The Lord seeing that the minds of His disciples would be upset by the sight of His passion, foretold to them both His coming suffering and His resurrection," Bede. "That He might strengthen the hearts of His disciples, who being forewarned would be less troubled and not thrown into fear by sudden events (He revealed His passion to them), and also to show that He suffered of His own free will. For he who foreknows and can fly and does not, manifestly has delivered himself to suffering voluntarily" (Theophylactus).

*"They understood nothing of these things."*

Certainly they knew that Our Lord was speaking of suffering and death. Indeed, St. Peter entered protest against such a misfortune happening to His Master. What they did not grasp was how it was possible that Christ if He was, as they believed, the promised Messiah and deliverer of Israel, should suffer death and that at the hands of Gentiles. Venerable Bede considers that even at this period they had recognized the Divinity of Christ, but this is not the common opinion.

"And they understood none of these things since they knew Him to be not only an innocent man, but truly God and thought such a One could not possibly die; and then because they knew Him to speak frequently in parables, they imagined that He was speaking allegorically when He mentioned anything about His passion" (Bede).

"Christ commemorated the chief details of His passion, lest if anything were left out, they would be disturbed in mind when they afterwards discovered it" (Chrysostom).

#### *Son of Man.*

This is the title which Our Lord made especially His own and constantly used when speaking of Himself. To others He was the Son of David, the Christ, the Messiah, the Prince of Peace. Nor in Christ's life-time was He called by others: "Son of Man," though both by the Psalmist and the Prophet Daniel this title was given to the Messiah. Our Lord did not deny the title "Son of God" when addressed to Him by others; but for Himself He chose the more human title.

This term was lifted into a Messianic one by the Prophet Daniel (vii. 13): "I beheld therefore in the vision of the night

and lo, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven." But it seems to have been lost sight of as a Messianic title. Not only does no one speak in the Gospels of the Messiah as the Son of Man, but in John xii. 13 they even ask what it implies. "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever, and now Thou sayest 'The Son of Man' must be lifted up; who is this Son of Man?"

*Why did Our Lord so frequently apply to Himself this appellation?*

1. To show the truth of His human nature.
2. From humility.
3. To draw men's hearts.
4. To separate the real Messianic idea from the false one attached by Jews to the other titles, e.g. : Son of David, Prince of Peace, Christus.
5. To establish His identity with Messiah of Daniel who was to judge men and come at the last day in power. In reference to Himself as the Servant spoken of by Isaias as a man of suffering.

Note that this is the formula always employed by Our Lord when speaking of His Passion.

This idea of a suffering Messiah had died out among the Jews and had been replaced by that of a Son of David who would restore the temporal kingdom, break the yoke of the Romans, extend the Jewish rule throughout the world, and establish the full observance of the Law.

By the avoidance of the term "Son of David" and the emphasis He lays upon "Son of Man" Christ combated the false Messianic idea, and put into prominence the suffering Messiah of Isaias and the Psalms. The Apostles and the disciples (as witness the speech of the two disciples on the way to Emmaus) did not in the life of Christ realize the work of Christ as Redeemer from sin, hence their failure to recognize that Christ's glory was to come through suffering and their redemption was to be purely spiritual.

This false idea explains also the bitter antagonism of the Scribes and Pharisees against the teaching and the influence of Christ with the populace; and why, in spite of His miracles, they rejected Him. If He did not promise to lift Israel to the temporal glory it had under Solomon, He was not merely not the true Messiah, but He was a public menace.

Only then by a few devout souls "looking for the Redemption of Israel," as Holy Simeon, Anna, Elizabeth, St. John Baptist, and His Holy Mother and Foster Father, was His identity recognized and acknowledged as the true Messiah, the glory of Israel. Of His hearers only a few inspired by the Holy Spirit declared: "A great Prophet has risen up amongst us and God has visited His people."

*First Sunday in Lent.**The Temptation of Christ.*

"Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert to be tempted by the devil" Matt. iv. 1.

The whole incident is full of mystery and awe, yet replete with lessons and consolations for Christ's tempted brethren.

*"He was led by the Spirit."*

St. Thomas tells us Christ entered of His own free will into the desert, the fasting and the subjection to the temptations. But it is also true that He was influenced and urged to all this by the action of the Holy Spirit upon His human mind and will.

The New Testament has marked references to the working of the Holy Spirit upon the human nature of Christ and the operations of His life. Thus it inspired and enlightened the Prophets, it worked the miracle of the Nativity, it poured upon Him the gifts enumerated by Isaias. It descended upon Him in visible form at His Baptism, it drove Him into the desert, it moved the minds of men to know and love Him, and it completed His work in founding the Church, it glorified Him and was glorified by Him.

*Fathers.*

"He was led not unwilling nor as one taken captive, but with the ardour of battle" Jerome. "He was led by the Holy Spirit not as one of less account commanded by a superior" (Chrysostom).

*Why Christ entered the Desert.*

Though St. Matthew says "ut tentaretur," the other evangelists do not put this forward as the reason, but as an incident. No doubt the prime reason was to prepare for His public life, by prayer and fasting after the manner of the Prophets, especially Moses and Elias.

*"And afterwards He was hungry."*

On this St. Basil remarks: "He was hungry not by the necessity which nature imposes, but in order to urge on the devil to combat, for the devil knowing that where hunger is weakness also is, proceeds to tempt." And St. Hilary: He was hungry "not from the gradual result of fasting, but because He abandoned His manhood to nature, for the devil was to be conquered not by God but by human nature"; and St. Chrysostom adds: "He did not fast longer than Moses and Elias lest it should throw discredit on the reality of His humanity."

*The Nature of the Temptations.*

Only three temptations are mentioned by the Evangelists in detail, but Venerable Bede and others hold that He was subject

to temptations the whole of His fast. This St. Mark would seem to suggest when he says: "He was in the desert forty days and forty nights and was tempted by the devil"; and St. Luke: "For the space of forty days and was tempted by the devil." St. Thomas says that this may be true, but it is not of visible ones like those mentioned, but of suggestions merely without appeal to the senses.

Nor would it seem that the devil gave up the contest altogether, but only for the time being, for St. Luke adds: "and all the temptations being ended, the devil left Him for a time." On which St. Ambrose remarks: "For a time, yes, because in the future he would not simply tempt, but would openly attack, namely, at the time of the Passion, when he would seem to have tempted Christ to sadness and hatred of His neighbour."

The temptations of Christ differed from ours in that they were entirely external, they did not soil nor disturb His soul. "If clear water be absolutely free from all impurity the rudest shock will not disturb or sully its sweet limpidity, yet if it rest on a muddy bottom the least movement will suffice to drabble it."

There was not in Christ those founts of internal temptation and conflict which are in us all. But, for all that, it was real and violent as coming from the Prince of tempters. There could not be in Christ internal temptation, for He had not the ignorance and weakness of will which comes from original sin. Nor that desire of evil, or concupiscence, by which we gravitate to evil. Nor again that proneness to evil which comes as the punishment of evil habits and past sins.

Then, too, His human soul had continually the Beatific Vision, by which knowing God as itself was known and confirmed in the love of God, it stood as the angels "above the reach of sacrilegious hands."

The devil then could only suggest to Our Lord to offend His Father, he could only play upon His imagination by phantasms and the appeal to the senses and natural appetites. Yet it is still true to say with the Apostle: "Now He can have compassion upon our infirmities for without sinning He hath been subject to all our temptations."

#### *The Form of the Temptations.*

Commentators and the Fathers point out how the devil pursued the same tactics with the second Adam as with the first, the appeal to the three concupiscences: gluttony, pride, and desire of worldly power. "Why hath God commanded that you should not eat of every tree?" "If thou be the Son of God command that these stones be made bread." Again: "Your eyes shall be opened." "Cast yourself down for He hath given His angels charge over Thee." "You shall be as Gods." "All these will I give Thee."

On this St. Hilary remarks: "O Devil you are bound by two opposites. If it is in Christ's power to turn stones into



bread, it is vain for you to tempt one with such power; if, however, He cannot do this it is in vain that you suspect Him to be God."

St. John Chrysostom: "When the devil could not conclude from Christ's answer whether He was God or man, he fell back on another temptation, saying to himself: One who is not conquered by hunger even if not the Son of God is at least a holy person, for holy persons are not overcome by hunger. But even when they are beyond the reach of hunger, they fall from vain glory, therefore, he started to tempt Him by vain glory."

St. Augustine: "Whoever without reasonable need exposes himself to danger tempts God, no matter what his action be."

St. Remigius: "The devil, in doubt after the second answer passes to a third, for when Christ had escaped the mesh of the stomach and broken through that of vain glory, he placed before Him the snare of avarice. How wonderfully foolish is the devil's madness. He thinks to lure with earthly goods Him Who gives to His faithful ones a Heavenly kingdom, and with worldly glory Him Who is the Lord of celestial bliss."

#### *Why did the Devil tempt Our Lord?*

He certainly did not know or even surmise that Christ was God, or he would not have dared to approach Him.

That He was not an ordinary man he knew from the phenomena of His birth, His life so far, His baptism, and the way in which He seemed untouched by the wiles of sin.

He, therefore, guessed from his knowledge of the Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messiah and from what he had hitherto observed in Christ that He was the promised one, the Son of David Who was destined to combat and conquer Satan.

He afterwards knew for certain the Messianic character of Christ, and as St. Mark tells us the devils cried out: "Thou art the Son of God," using the term in its sense of son by nature, though as almost all the Fathers hold, the devils did not know the Divine personality of Christ though they addressed Him as such, and because they did know this were bid hold their peace. As St. Augustine remarks: "Christ only allowed devils to know just as much as He willed."

#### *Our Lord's manner of combating the temptation.*

There is a wonderful simplicity, directness and conquering power in Our Lord's replies to Satan's suggestion. Like the temptations they were taken from the Scriptures. The first from Deut. viii. 2, 3; the second Deut. vi. 16; and the last from Deut. vi. 13. Here the devil is hoisted by his own petard, slain by the sword of the Spirit.

*Second Sunday in Lent.*

*The Transfiguration.*

*"And He was transfigured before them."*

*What it was.*

The soul of Our Lord enjoyed the glory of the Beatific Vision from the first moment of its existence. This follows naturally as a consequence of the hypostatic Union and the dignity attaching to the personality of the Divine Sonship. This is the unanimous teaching of theologians and the consensus of the faithful, though not so expressed in the Scriptures. Petavius I, II, c.4, n.3.

This glory of the soul of Christ would have streamed continuously through the veil of flesh during His sojourn on earth had He not restrained it miraculously, as He did the presence of His Divine nature, under the garb of our humanity.

This concealment was necessary if He was to carry out His mission of Redemption. "It behoveth Christ first to suffer and then to enter into His glory." The glory which the soul of Christ permanently illuminated in this mystery of Transfiguration, the body; it was the body of Christ that was momentarily transfigured and shone as the sun.

But as St. Jerome points out: it was not a new body, but that which Mary gave Him which appeared bright and glorious. "No one," he says, "believes that in the transfiguration Christ lost His former body and countenance, and assumed a new spiritual and astral body. This the evangelist proves when he states 'His face shone as the sun and His garment became white as snow.' Here is asserted then the brightness of His face and the whiteness of His garments, their substance is not destroyed but changed by the glory" (Jer. on Matt., cap. 17). Again, St. John Damascene remarks: "Since by reason of the hypostatic union, the glory of the Word and of His flesh are one, Christ was transfigured, not as receiving what He had not, but as revealing to His disciples that which He had."

It would seem from the fact that while Our Lord prayed and was transfigured, the Apostles were asleep, that this miracle took place like the Agony in the Garden (to which these same Apostles were invited and slept) at night time when Our Lord was accustomed to retire for the purpose of prayer.

Awaking, they witnessed the Christ's glory and the attendant prophets, and heard part, at least, of the conversation going on between the three.

How St. Peter recognized Moses and Elias so as to mention their names to Christ, we can only suppose was by means of an interior inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Though neither St. Matthew nor St. Mark tells us what prompted St. Peter to say: "let us build," etc., St. Luke tells us that it was the thought that Moses and Elias were leaving and that the glorious visitation would then end. Besides, if

these were to abide on the mountain, Christ also would, and then He would not go up to Jerusalem as He had before intimated He would, and not going would not fall into the hands of His enemies.

But as St. Mark points out, the Apostles were so overwhelmed by awe and fear, that they knew not what they were saying. But in this wish St. Peter was wrong as far as his own good went, because as St. John Damascene points out: "If they remained on the mount the promise made to Peter would not be accomplished, he would not have received the gift of the keys, nor would the tyranny of death be removed."

There would seem to be a fitness quite apparent in the choice of these three Apostles in preference to the others, because as they were to be chosen as the witnesses of His suffering in the Garden they might by the prevision of His glory be strengthened against temptation to despair at the sight of His agony and cross. That it had a lasting impression upon the Apostles both St. John and St. Peter bear witness. "We have seen His glory," says the beloved Apostle, "the glory as of the only Begotten of the Father full of grace and truth"; and St. Peter: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables when we made known to you the power and presence of our Lord Jesus Christ, but having been eye witnesses of His majesty. For He received from God His Father honour and glory, this voice coming down to Him from the excellent glory, This is my well-beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased. Hear ye Him. And this Voice we heard brought from Heaven when we were with Him on the Holy Mount."

#### *Why Moses and Elias.*

The Fathers see a fitness in these being present as having fasted forty days, having delivered the Jews from a tyrant king and a false worship, and as representing the Law and the Prophets.

The three Apostles seem to be chosen because destined to be witnesses of the Agony in the garden, and to be distinguished afterwards, one as head of the Church, one as the first martyr, the last as the Apostle of love of Christ and of His Divinity.

#### *The Voice from the cloud.*

This is the second of the Heavenly testimonies, the first of which took place at Christ's Baptism and the third soon after His triumphant entry into Jerusalem; and they were the seal of the Father and the Holy Ghost upon the Divinity and eternal Sonship of Christ.

Our Lord did not explain this vision nor its purpose. He left it as an abiding memory in the minds of the Apostles and a pledge of the glory which awaits the risen just at the latter day.

#### *The reserve of Christ.*

Our Lord having manifested this glory to His chosen ones

commanded them to tell the vision to no man till after the Resurrection. The reason for this is to be sought in the Mission of Christ, and in the false ideas as to the person and work of the Messiah which prevailed among the Jews. Had the glory of His transfiguration been known this knowledge would occasion among them visions of a glorious monarch and a new temporal kingdom of Israel.

Then also, after His resurrection men would be less inclined to doubt the Apostles' word because the glory of His resurrection would render easy of belief anything which the Apostles might relate of Him. Also He may have wished to prevent any envy among the other Apostles who had not been admitted to this mystery.

### *Third Sunday in Lent.*

*The cure of the blind and dumb demoniac.*

"He casteth out devils by Beelzebub."

That this man was blind as well as dumb we learn from St. Matthew's account.

#### *The Old Testament.*

We have no definite proof of possession in the old Law. Power to tempt and to harm externally and even take away life, yes, as in the case of Job and of the suitors of Sara in the Book of Tobias, and of Saul, but nothing more. What is said of Saul, "that the spirit of God left him and an evil spirit troubled him," is not clear enough for a positive proof.

#### *New Testament.*

In the New Testament there is abundant evidence. Devils were cast out by Our Lord and by His disciples by His power, and by the Apostles in the Acts, and as the present Gospel shows by the Jews under Divine authority, "by the finger of God."

#### *Historic Evidence.*

The writings of the Fathers show that among the pagans and also among the early Christians possession and exorcisms were frequent. Saint Paulinus relates in the Life of St. Felix the case of a demon cast out at the tomb of the saint. Another case is mentioned in the work of Sulpitius Severus of a demoniac cured by the touch of a relic of St. Martin.

#### *Missionary Experiences.*

Among the unbaptised inhabitants of heathen countries, missionaries find and record frequent cases of true possession.

It is quite probable, judging from the phenomena, that many inhabitants of asylums to-day and also some of the mediums of Spiritism are under diabolical influences.

*The Authority of the Church.*

The Church, by the fact that she has in her ritual exorcisms, and in her minor orders that of exorcist, testifies to her belief in these things even nowadays.

*The Signs of Possession.*

These are generally classed as "speaking unknown tongues or understanding them, knowledge of distant and hidden occurrences, physical powers beyond the known forces of nature, and so on. A caution is here needed to take into account the possibilities which arise from the workings of the subconscious memory.

Certainly the recorded violences of Satan contained in the Old Testament find illustrations in the lives of mystics and saints, for instance, in those of St. Anthony of the desert and the Curé d'Ars.

*Intrinsic Possibility.*

The soul may not be possessed in this life by demons but there is no inherent impossibility of bodies being so occupied.

As diseases and death are by God's permission within natural forces so also He may permit devils to produce the same.

The devil though fallen has the native powers of a spirit and its sources of knowledge.

Thirdly, as St. Bonaventure remarks, God may permit this malady, as He does sin and greater evil, either to show forth His Divine glory ("Neither this man nor his parents but that the works of God may be manifest"), or again as a punishment or a correction or an instruction. Which of these reasons may be the real one in any given case is known only to God. But this at least is true that they may not be except for adequate reasons seeing that in all things God is just.

*Why frequent in Gospel times and in Galilee.*

This Gospel fact is accounted for by the anxiety of Satan to counteract the work of Our Lord and His influence with and acceptance by the people. This influence of Our Lord was more in Galilee than elsewhere, the Scribes and Pharisees doing the devil's work in other parts of Palestine.

*Not Merely Mental Disorders.*

This is clear from the fact that Christ commanded the spirits, spoke to them, was spoken to by them and they were silenced by Christ. Then, too, distinct mention is made of purely natural diseases healed by Our Lord. Moreover, most accounts are by St. Luke, himself a physician and one of the most careful writers.

To deny all this evidence, scriptural and historical, as modernists do, is to discredit the Gospels and destroy all evidence in matters historical.

The Scribes and Pharisees did not deny the facts, they only tried to rob Our Lord of the credit for them and to lower Him in the eyes of the people as a mere magician. "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub." This, of course, is a possibility in the case of the devils themselves, but is not likely except for a greater possession.

*Our Lord's Reply.*

Our Lord's answer is to show the unlikelihood of any such exorcism not only by Himself but by the demons directly. For this would be to ruin their own dominion.

The second argument is "ad hominem." You cast out devils; by whose power? "the finger of God." Why then may I not do the same? To say devils are cast out by Beelzebub is to ruin your own case.

From these principles and the fact that before their eyes a devil has been cast out, Our Lord concludes to His Messiaship, since this is one of the signs by which the Messiah is to be recognized when He comes, as St. John Baptist acknowledged.



## NOTES ON RECENT WORK

### I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

BY THE REV. GEORGE D. SMITH, Ph.D., D.D.

During the past ninety years the University of Louvain has given to the theological world a valuable series of interesting and scholarly studies in the form of theses presented to the Faculty for the degree of Master in Theology. It is, therefore, high praise of Dr. Werner Goossens' *Les origines de l'Eucharistie, Sacrement et Sacrifice*,<sup>1</sup> a thesis published last year, to say that it is not unworthy of its predecessors. Rather than a study of dogmatic theology, properly so-called, it is a treatise of apologetics, and a very opportune treatise indeed, for it answers the pertinent question: Who instituted the Eucharist? Those theologians are to be envied their tranquillity of mind—though their wisdom might justly be doubted—who in these days consider themselves at liberty to devote their attention exclusively to theological speculation. The pressing needs of the day demand a closer study of fundamentals, for it is upon these that the modern attack is concentrated. Since the year 1893, when Harnack's famous *Brod und Wasser* appeared, rationalist critics have propounded many theories to account for the origin of the Eucharist, all of which, in spite of their fantastic variety, agree in denying that Christ instituted it as sacrament and sacrifice, such as it exists in Catholic doctrine and practice to-day. Dr. Goossens devotes the first part of his work to a full exposition of these opinions, in the course of which he does not fail to give due recognition to the many valuable fruits of modern research into Eucharistic origins. Not the least interesting among these is the fact that the majority of independent exegetes pronounce in favour of the realistic interpretation of the words of Christ at the Last Supper.

The second part contains a critical analysis of the Eucharistic texts of the New Testament, from which the author concludes, on purely hermeneutical grounds, that all the essential elements of Catholic doctrine and practice can be traced only to Christ Himself. In the third part of his work Dr. Goossens subjects to a searching examination those modern systems which would derive the Eucharist from the infiltration of pagan mystery-religions, and his conclusion, based upon a thorough and painstaking review of the evidence, is that "à mesure que l'on a étudié de plus près l'histoire religieuse de l'Empire, il est apparu davantage que l'eucharistie n'est pas le fait d'emprunts, ni l'aboutissement d'une longue évolution de croyances, ni

<sup>1</sup> Beauchesne, Paris, 1931. pp. xxiii and 390. 50 fr.

l'achèvement des cultes à mystères. Il y a tout au plus lieu d'affirmer que dans l'ambiance créée par les religions orientales, la prédication de l'eucharistie, sacrement et mystère, a pu trouver quelque préparation lointaine et quelques fragiles appuis" (p. 323). The book concludes with a demonstration of the failure of modern hypotheses to account for the origin of the Eucharist, otherwise than upon the supposition that Christ Himself instituted it as sacrament and sacrifice.

Nevertheless, Dr. Goossens, in common with Dom Casel, and other Catholic authors who have devoted much study to the comparative history of religions, is inclined to distinguish a third aspect of the Eucharist—in addition to the traditional aspects of sacrament and sacrifice—that of "mystery." The word is used in this connection, not in the accepted theological sense, but as indicating a type of cult commonly found in religions that flourished during the period of the Roman Empire, and is defined by the author as "an act of cult, which by means of certain rites represents an economy of salvation; by carrying out these rites, the believer partakes of this economy, and thus accomplishes his own salvation" (p. xi). It seems unlikely, however, that this terminology will ever become accepted among theologians, both by reason of the confusion to which it would inevitably give rise, and also because this aspect of the Eucharist is already sufficiently denoted by the name sacrament. For a sacrament, says S. Thomas, "est signum rememorativum ejus quod praecessit, scilicet passionis Christi, et demonstrativum ejus quod in nobis efficitur per Christi passionem, scilicet gratiae, et prognosticum, idest praenuntiativum futurae gloriae" (III q. 60, art. 2). The "mystery-aspect" of the Eucharist should not, therefore, it seems, be juxtaposed to the traditional aspects, but included as a subdivision of its sacramental significance.

Interesting, too, though less as a constructive study than as an example of what may perhaps be called Eucharistic eclecticism, is Dr. Yngve Brilioth's *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*, the Swedish original being translated by the Rev. A. G. Herbert, M.A.<sup>2</sup> With regard to the origin of the Eucharist the author's solution is somewhat vague. "Here then we have what is surely the only possible answer to the question which we asked: whether it can truly be claimed that the Eucharist of the Church was instituted by Our Lord. For our faith it must be sufficient to be certain, as we can be certain, that this holy rite stood from the very beginning at the centre of the stream of spiritual life which had its source in the Master Himself, and which is itself the chief witness to the power which is in Him" (p. 13). In the opinion of Dr. Brilioth: "no particular view can be claimed, on the basis of the New Testament, as the norm and standard by which all subsequent developments are to be judged" (p. 14). For in the New Testament itself he discovers at least four types of

<sup>2</sup> S.P.C.K., 1930. pp. xiii and 295. 12s. 6d.

Eucharistic doctrine—variously called “aspects” or “anti-theses”—of which he traces the development through history down to the present day. His treatment of the Eucharistic teaching of the early Fathers is disappointingly jejune. Perhaps the most interesting parts of the book, from a Catholic point of view, are the chapter on Luther, and the author’s extraordinary description of the Eucharistic theology of the Middle Ages (pp. 78 ff). He laments the triumph of the realistic view as shown in the “acceptance” of transubstantiation by the Lateran Council of 1215, referring to this doctrine—hearken, O Cyril of Jerusalem!—as a formula “which had been forced on theology by the materialism of popular piety,” and as giving “official sanction to the carnalism of the worsser sort of popular religion.” The wonderful Eucharistic synthesis of S. Thomas is dismissed contemptuously, together with the work of the other great scholastics, as a “hair-splitting analysis.” Why are clearness of thought and precision of language anathema to so many contemporary theologians?

On the occasion of the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicaea, Père d’Alès wrote a delightful little book *Le dogme de Nicée*. Last year he celebrated the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Ephesus by giving us another gem: *Le dogme d’Ephèse*.<sup>3</sup> With that light yet sure touch of the master which characterizes all his work he delineates the doctrinal tendencies which led to the heresy of Nestorius, and relates the history of the Council which condemned it. Under his vivacious pen all the actors in this drama seem to come to life again: the handsome and arrogant, eloquent but ill-instructed Nestorius; John of Antioch vacillating between loyalty to his headstrong friend, and the orthodoxy of which, in spite of himself, he sees Cyril to be the champion; Cyril himself, strong in the righteousness of his cause, yet not always tactful in the promotion of it, nor always exact in the choice of words. Père d’Alès shows little sympathy for the heresiarch who, according to some modern historians, has been cruelly maligned. “Accordons à Nestorius,” he writes, “le bénéfice d’une certaine ignorance: aucune excuse ne saurait lui être favorable. Mais pour être hérétique, il n’est pas nécessaire de posséder une science bien étendue; un peu d’entêtement suffit” (p. 252). The case for S. Cyril, who even at the hands of Catholic historians has not always received full justice, is presented by Père d’Alès strongly and impartially. It was unfortunate, no doubt, that the Patriarch of Alexandria should not have awaited the arrival of his brother of Antioch before opening the Council. But the circumstances were difficult. The doctrinal decision had already been made in Rome, and Cyril had received from the Pope the official mission of enforcing it. The situation at Ephesus was becoming daily more and more alarming; the papal legates had not yet arrived to lend Cyril the strong support which he needed, while on the other hand the imperial legate

<sup>3</sup> Beauchesne, Paris. 1931. pp.vi and 312.

was already present with an armed force, to insist upon the appointment of John of Antioch as President of the Council. The personal influence of John of Antioch, when he arrived, would certainly be thrown into the scale against S. Cyril, and might render it impossible to execute the decision of the Apostolic See. Such considerations, the author acutely points out, will hardly weigh with those who regard Catholic dogma as an elastic formula to be subjected to parliamentary discussion, but with Cyril, who regarded it as a sacred charge committed by Christ to the teaching authority of the Church, they were paramount.

The last chapter of this little book, in which the respective doctrines of Nestorius and Cyril are examined and contrasted, may be confidently recommended to any who still doubt whether Nestorius was a Nestorian.

It is in many ways regrettable that the requirements of controversy, especially since the time of the Reformation, have caused the treatise *De Ecclesia* in nearly all our theological works to be taken out of its proper context, and relegated to Fundamental Theology. The result has inevitably been that by the showing of the apologist the Church appears, if not exclusively, at any rate chiefly, as a visible society instituted by Christ for the salvation of mankind, a society evidently recognizable as such by the marks of unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity, a society hierarchical in its constitution and monarchical in its government, outside which there is no salvation. All this is true, but surely it is only half—and less than half—the truth. The concept of the Church as the continuance of the Word Incarnate, as the pleroma, the fulfilment of Christ, as His mystical body, is here almost lost to sight, and the true place which the Church occupies in the scheme of dogmatic theology is liable to be overlooked. It is, therefore, with particular pleasure that we welcome Père Hurtevent's *L'Unité de l'Eglise du Christ*,<sup>4</sup> a work for which we have none but the highest praise; for it is full of good things. It is not a treatise of apologetics; it is a clear and concise exposition of the Catholic doctrine and theology of the Unity of the Church. The author, in a modest preface, disclaims any pretention to writing a scientific work. If a book is made scientific by copious references to sources, then Père Hurtevent has not been too modest. But his work has every other claim to the title. The author follows the novel method of devoting the whole of his first part to the plain exposition of Catholic doctrine, without adducing any theological proofs. The advantages of this method are obvious: the reader is able to appreciate the doctrine itself in all its harmonious proportions, without the mind being distracted by the necessity of weighing the arguments advanced.

The theme of the book may be outlined in a few words. The source and the explanation of all unity is to be found in God

<sup>4</sup> Bonne Presse, Paris. pp. xlvii and 424. 12 fr.

Himself, in that divine life which, without losing anything of its unity, is communicated among the three divine Persons. That divine life finds its diffusion first in the hypostatic union in Christ, truly God and truly man, and is participated in His human soul by sanctifying grace and the infused virtues. From Christ it is transmitted in the Church to individual souls, who are united among themselves and with Christ by this ineffable participation in the life of God, which is grace. This unity of life brings with it unity of mind in the same truth, unity of wills in the same charity which is poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit. But the Church, which is the fullness of Christ, is a visible society, and its members are visibly united through a visible hierarchy, of which the successor of S. Peter is the head. There are not two Churches, one visible and the other invisible, but one, as body and soul form one person. External unity is subordinated to the invisible unity of which it is the cause and the guardian.

All this is set out clearly in the first part of the work; all this is proved theologically and systematically explained in the second part. I rejoice to see that the author refrains from making excessive use of the analogy of body and soul to explain the two elements in the Church, the visible and the invisible. Thus, in explaining the famous dictum *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*, he does not increase the difficulty of the problem by saying that non-Catholics in good faith belong to the soul of the Church and not to the body, but gives a solution which is as simple as it is theologically sound; "Qui n'est pas membre de ce corps est soustrait à l'action de l'Esprit de Dieu, exclu de la possession de l'héritage surnaturel qu'il nous apporte. Il est vrai, l'appartenance à ce corps visible peut n'être qu'invisible, c'est à dire que sans lui avoir été incorporé sensiblement, on peut cependant lui appartenir par le désir . . ." (p. 412). An excellent book, deserving close study and serious consideration.

In *The Way of Life*,<sup>5</sup> Fr. MacGillivray has succeeded beyond measure in solving the difficult problem of combining conciseness with simplicity. To have compressed within the space of 270 pages what is virtually a treatise of Christian apologetics and an exposition of Catholic doctrine, dogmatic as well as moral, is a remarkable achievement. But to have done all this without sacrificing clearness and simplicity of expression is more remarkable still. I venture to say that there is not a page of this book which anyone, however devoid of theological training, could not fully understand. For this reason it seems that it might most suitably be recommended by priests to converts under instruction; it is an excellent commentary and development of the Catechism. But it by no means follows the order and arrangement of the Catechism. If one may be permitted to say so, the arrangement of Fr. MacGillivray's book is very much better. Like Père Hurtevent, the author groups

<sup>5</sup> Burns, Oates & Washbourne. pp. ix and 277. 6s.

the whole of Catholic teaching and practice round the central idea of the divine life communicated to man. The Catholic Church teaches the way of life, the eternal life which Christ came to restore to us, and which He actually gives to us through our union with His mystical body—the Church. Subsequently, the Sacraments, the commandments, prayer, mortification, the intercession of Our Lady and the Saints, and many other matters, are all explained in their intimate relation with the fundamental truth that man has been raised to the august destiny of sharing by grace in the divine life of the Blessed Trinity.

Of outstanding importance, and deserving of much more detailed attention than can be devoted to it in this catalogue of recent publications, is Dr. Messenger's great work *Evolution and Theology*,<sup>6</sup> published last month. It will receive due notice in the reviewer's pages. But any reviewer, I think, will find it difficult to do justice to the painstaking research, the clear philosophical insight, and the power of lucid exposition, which have gone to produce this truly monumental book. I leave him to do his best, contenting myself in the meantime with offering the author heartiest congratulations upon his noteworthy achievement.

## II. PHILOSOPHY.

BY JOHN G. VANCE.

Years ago in 1913, Edmund Husserl wrote his book *Ideen* on Phenomenonology which was recognized throughout the Continent as a mighty effort at constructive philosophy in the Kantian tradition. It is, without doubt, the most significant philosophic effort of our time. Like Kant, Dr. Husserl was frequently almost unintelligible, partly by reason of the extraordinary difficulty of his subject matter and partly owing to an unholy clumsiness of phrase. How bad the Germans can be as expositors! This remarkable volume has now been translated, *Ideas*.<sup>7</sup> The deftness of the translation scarcely makes the work easier, though Dr. Husserl's special introduction casts a little new light sometimes. This Phenomenology, let it be said at once, is not a phenomenism. It is an epistemology, an engine of critical philosophy, a method. It takes up Kant's problem set in the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* and attempts to deal with it more analytically and more thoroughly.

The effort throughout is to get at the naked structure and activity of the mind itself—not the merely psychological phenomenon yielded by introspection—but the active, formal *a priori*, mental determinant of all experience. In this way, Dr. Husserl maintains, we may grasp the very noetic structure

<sup>6</sup> Burns, Oates & Washbourne. pp. xxiv and 313. 12s. 6d.

<sup>7</sup> Allen & Unwin: Library of Philosophy.



itself by which the essence of things—not their individual characteristics—is “intuited.” Thus above and beyond the empirical ego, there is a transcendental ego which constructs all objects and their essence, according to its own transcendental formal activity. Throughout the work the quest is for the very essential nature of pure consciousness itself, though always, be it noted, for the pure consciousness of the metaphysician and epistemologist and not of the psychologist. Dr. Husserl moreover, calls for a radical reconstruction of metaphysic and of all philosophy.

The thought is often not easy to grasp: it is, in fact, as inaccessible as is scholasticism to our contemporaries. It is not a system that will appeal to our schools. It is, however, a coherent vision worked out with almost relentless labour. On that account it is worthy of our study, for Dr. Husserl is an opponent of fine metal.

Now and again a book of importance appears among the elaborate and diverse publications of the International Library of Psychology. No doubt the attention of readers was directed a year ago to a remarkable study of Mr. H. G. Wyatt, entitled, *The Psychology of Intelligence and Will*. A recent volume of Mr. Charles Fox, Director of Training of Teachers at Cambridge, on *The Mind and its Body*, calls for comment. In it, Mr. Fox, whose Educational Psychology is well known, considers again with freshness and skill, the essentially modern setting of the problem of mind and body. The clue to his attitude is found in his challenging title. He has been haunted, we perceive, by the physiologists' and materialists' view that the mental process is the upshot or outcome of some bodily event. In his introductory argument he indicates his conclusion that in considering the mind-body problem, all the explanatory concepts are not physical or physiological but strictly psychological. A little further he remarks, “This makes it quite unnecessary to suppose that mental images are dependent on the same brain centres as their corresponding sensations; or even to assume that there is any necessity whatever for an underlying physiological basis for images . . . If this view is justified, it cuts the ground away from the belief that the mind is completely dependent on the body . . .” This argument is pursued in the book through the most diverse and interesting psychological phenomena, often with wise criticism and refreshing comments, and leads to constructive suggestions.

What a pity, we reflect, that Mr. Fox has not studied a little Greek or neo-Greek metaphysic! If he had, would he have said that temperament and personality were both not scientific but artistic concepts? And might he not have seen that the whole mind-body problem was thrust upon an unsuspecting modern world by the mathematical Descartes, when he rejected the classical vision of the human nature as a compound of two principles working by accidental powers? If further, he had learnt the significance of our far-reaching maxim—*actiones sunt*

*suppositorum*—he would have found the constructive answer to his whole mind-body problem ready to hand. The book, however, merits careful reading as it meets the moderns, who are often so hopelessly confused both in their terminology and ideas, on their own ground.

Professor Robert Woodsworth, of Columbia, whose *Psychology and Study of Mental Life* has been a solace to many students, now gives us a good, clear study of *Contemporary Schools of Psychology*.<sup>8</sup> It will be useful to everyone, professor, specialist and student, as the author is calm, thoughtful and judicious. He discusses the introspective and existential schools, giving a brief but not unsatisfactory account of the work of Müller, Ebbinghaus, Binet, Külpe, Marbe, Ach and Watt, then turns to the Behaviourists, the Gestalt Psychologists or Configurationists, the Psycho-Analytic schools, and lastly to the Purposivism of William McDougall. In each treatment there is something good, and the whole is both compact and informative. When we read these valuable American digests of schools, theories and tendencies, we wonder why the Americans ever gave up this work, in which they really excel, in favour of the constructive efforts, like Pragmatism and Behaviourism. In these latter domains they surely meet with scant success.

In a philosophic causerie it is not our business to refer in detail to works like *An Outline of Modern Knowledge*,<sup>9</sup> which as been boomed and sold by the thousand. Much of it is useful and interesting, though most of us have learnt to be wary of these curt summaries which are no more than brief, non-committal analyses of other men's digests. They are sometimes knowledge at fifth and sixth hand, and dead as a door-nail. Thus Professor Wolf has the hopeless task of compressing into 45 pages his account of the history of thought. Yes! it begins with the Ancient times and pre-Socratic thinkers and wanders through the Middle Ages down to Darwin. Where I can check the statements they are often faulty. His account of mediæval science shows no contact whatever with facts established long enough ago by Duhem, in his *Système du Monde* and his treatment of the scholastic shows no contact with the original texts. To my regret I saw that Maimonides, the great Moses Ben Maimon, who has influenced the thought of mankind so profoundly, was just named in passing as the professor swept hurriedly forward. In a bibliographical note there is no reference to any work, even on the history of mediæval philosophy, so that we assume that Professor Wolf is just repeating what he heard or read somewhere. But is this knowledge? And is it either useful or true? We hasten to add that the same professor further on in the book has a valuable paper on "Recent and Contemporary Philosophy." For these vivid summaries of books actually read we are grateful. In some ways this paper is even a model.

<sup>8</sup> Methuen.

<sup>9</sup> Gollancz.

Dr. Aveling's treatment of Psychology is not without its interest, though we wish he could have omitted the brief and sometimes unconvincing historical summary. Yes! we begin with ancient times and hurry through the Greeks and mediæval men down to the contemporary schools. The author gives us the impression of playing for safety in criticising the different schools, and in consequence his treatment lacks that definiteness and vigour which alone can give life to these terrible synopses.

Dean Matthews in his paper on *The Idea of God* is obviously influenced by the fact that he was professor of the philosophy of religion until recently appointed to the Deanery of Exeter. Now frankly, we wonder if there be such a subject as the philosophy of religion. We know of a *mixum-gatherum* called by that name, which culls its subject matter from anthropology, sociology, comparative religions, history and pre-history, philosophy, science and theology. We prefer the older vision whereby religion had a history, that is the history of religions and their comparison, and a science to be found in theological treatise *De Vera Religione*. Dr. Matthews' paper will not suggest many new ideas to our schools, though it contains much that is both thoughtful and stimulating. In one page we read: "The rational arguments (for the existence of God) were formerly supposed by Thomas Aquinas and Leibniz to give a direct demonstration of the existence of God, a demonstration so cogent that none who understood them could reasonably fail to be convinced by them. The modern mind thinks in a different way. . . . Among the possible hypotheses there is Theism. . . . Modern religious philosophy . . . would suggest rather that among all the possible hypotheses to answer the problem of the meaning of the world and of life, the hypothesis of God, when all the data are considered, is the most reasonable. . . ." Now we Catholics also are moderns, and our philosophers and theologians, often at their very best in the treatment of *de Deo Uno*, are contemporaries. They all hold, and they count many distinguished protagonists, that the existence of God can be proved by reason alone. Moreover, the whole Catholic world of untold millions believes this. I wonder if Dr. Matthews could get such a consensus of opinion anywhere else in the world for any proposition, attitude or hypothesis. And ought not some little recognition be accorded to us, who are perhaps the only specialists on this very question?

If the Dean has no more than hypothesis, however convincing, for the existence of God, is not religion for him rather hypothetical? And is it not dreadfully difficult to begin?

And how build on shifting sands?

Many will buy this outline of modern knowledge and not read it. This, indeed, would seem to be the fate of the big guns among scientific best sellers. But when multitudes of plain men put their hand on the outline of modern knowledge and say proudly: "This is what we men know," we should like to

make a ghostly appearance and just suggest a surviving query or an ultimate doubt. That is all.

It is not necessary to introduce to English readers the extraordinarily valuable series, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, at present edited by Dr. Martin Grabmann. There lies under our hand the third fascicule of the thirtieth volume, and in these thirty volumes we have the best available studies of our mediæval philosophers, their texts, theories, derivations, origins and meanings. They are, indeed, a monument of international and German philosophic industry. Unfortunately, our schools and scholars work in water-tight compartments in spite of the Latin tongue and the common cause. There is the group of those who write for students the unending text books which sometimes seem to be evolved in an historic vacuum. Then side by side there are pioneer studies of enduring value like many in the *Beiträge* series, which are quite unknown to the text-book writers, indeed as unknown to them as to the enemies of scholasticism. It is a thousand pities that so little of this knowledge and research trickles through to our students. The latest volume is *Das Problem der Wahrheitssicherung bei Thomas von Aquin*, by Dr. Paul Wilpert, and bears the sub-title: *A Contribution to the History of the Problem of Evidence*. After a spirited introduction, Dr. Wilpert says that all the necessary principles and many of the detailed applications and arguments necessary for the essentially modern study of epistemology are to be found in St. Thomas' writings. He has searched through the Thomistic corpus for all the relevant texts, which he here puts together lucidly. In successive chapters he treats of the conception of truth, the problems of certainty, the nature and possibility of evidence. Later he discusses the mediate evidence of the sciences, empirical evidence and the *a priori* evidence of principles. He closes with a contrast between the guiding conceptions of St. Augustine and St. Thomas in their handling of these inspiring themes. The work is a model of brevity and economy of words. How good German expositors can sometimes be! It is not a mere collocation of texts with footnotes of ferocious length. It moves forward—how rare this is in contemporary scholastic literature—with an immanent logic of its own and is intellectually exhilarating. The reference to contemporary scholastics is adequate without being overburdened.

Did space allow, we should like to have noticed (1) Mr. Joseph's *Ethics*; (2) Pere Maréchal's *Le Problème de Dieu d'après M. Edouard Le Roy*, interesting for the understanding both of Pere Maréchal and M. Le Roy. (3) M. Maritain's *Religion et Culture*, which calls for detailed comment as the author's scholasticism is of a special kind; and (4) certain philosophic articles, particularly those on Occam and on Ontologism in the latest volume just to hand of the *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*.

## III. SCIENCE.

BY THE REV. H. V. GILL, S.J., M.A., M.Sc.

The tendency of present-day physical science appears to be theoretical and even "metaphysical" rather than practical. Theory, on the other hand, tends to be more difficult and complicated as the number of known facts increases. The increasing complication of scientific discovery creates difficulties which the older theories fail to explain, and which involve very complicated mathematical treatment. The principles of Relativity and Wave-Mechanics, originally devised to reconcile apparently contradictory phenomena, have by their success—as far as it has gone—involved new difficulties. Yet even incomplete theories have not been without their value. Perhaps the most important of these modern theories is what we may call "the wave-theory of matter" associated with the names of de Broglie and Schrödinger. The intimate relationship between light and electrons gave rise to difficulties which suggested that light, while in many respects obeying the laws of wave-motion, yet in others seemed to act as if composed of particles or *quanta* of energy. The fact that the energy with which an electron moved under the influence of light depended, not on the intensity of the light, but on frequency of vibration, also pointed to a similar duality in the case of an electron. Arising from these suspicions experiments were made on electrons with the object of determining if electrons did as a matter of fact partake of the nature of waves. In 1925 Elsasser suggested that, after the manner of X-rays, electrons might be studied from the point of view of their reflection from the atoms of a crystal.

It is not necessary to go into the history of the development of the experimental work done in this direction. Perhaps the most interesting results are those obtained recently by Professor G. P. Thomson and others working on the reflection of electrons from the face of a crystal, at very small angles. The results show very clearly that the electrons—or rather the electrons with their accompanying wave-systems—interfere after the manner of waves of light. Owing to the power possessed by fast-moving electrons of affecting a photographic plate these results can be permanently recorded. The spots and rings of "electron interference" may be seen visually by allowing the electrons, after reflection, to fall on a williamite screen.

The great distinguishing difference between light-waves and moving charged particles is that the path of the former is not affected when the beam passes through an electric or magnetic field, while that of the latter is deflected by even moderate electric and magnetic forces. When a magnetic field was applied to the reflected beam of electrons it was found that the whole system of interference markings was displaced as in the case of ordinary electrons. The conclusion is, therefore, that the electrons themselves involve a periodic or wave effect. This is generally expressed by saying that the moving electrons give



rise to a wave system which "guides" the electrons in certain directions. But it is the "electron which does the work." Needless to say the complete working out of the theory involves many postulates and a certain amount of scientific faith. But the results are there for all to see.

However, we need not suppose that the last word has been said on the theory. The electron produces the waves and the waves guide the electron, a highly artificial supposition. The following passage from G. P. Thomson's book will suffice to indicate the position:—

A question that inevitably arises is: What is the medium which transmits electron waves? I am sorry that I can give no entirely satisfactory answer. For the first time, physics is faced with waves in empty space which do not fit into the ordinary series of ether vibrations. All the ether vibrations differ only in wave-length; if the wave-length is given the kind of "light" is fixed. The electron waves have varying wave-lengths depending on the speed of the electron, but they usually fall in a region of wave-lengths which is already appropriated by X-rays. As we have seen they are certainly not the same as X-rays. One must suppose some other medium, or at least that the ordinary ether is in some way profoundly modified by the presence of the electron. It is possible to suppose that they are waves in a "sub-ether." But it is not a very attractive idea to have two ethers filling space, especially as the waves of protons—if they exist—would demand a third. Space is becoming overcrowded. Other suggestions are to regard the waves as a kind of mathematical abstraction, a sort of ghost waves. The whole question is getting very metaphysical. . . .

In fact, the solution of the original difficulty has given rise to others more fundamental still.<sup>10</sup>

The famous discussion at this year's meeting of the British Association on The Evolution of the Universe in "Section A" has been reported in the Press, and is given in full in *Nature* for October 24th. It is of interest in connection with the above remarks about electrons, as indicating the two extremes of physical science to-day—the "infinitely small" and the "infinitely great." In the one we consider multitudes of tiny entities so small that they can only be recognized by means of most delicate instruments used with great skill, while in the other we are concerned with dimensions so enormous and durations of such appalling magnitude that the mere numbers employed fail to convey anything to the imagination. Yet, in spite of the size of the universe, and of the number of units of which it is composed, whether it be now increasing in size, or decreasing, or in a condition of oscillation between a greater

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *L'ancienne et la nouvelle théorie des Quanta*, E. Bloch, 1930. *The Wave Mechanics of Free Electrons*, G. P. Thomson, 1930. *New Conceptions of Matter*, 1931, C. G. Darwin. The latter is very readable.



and a lesser limit, it must finally cease to exist as far as human life is concerned. According to the law of entropy the material universe is tending towards a state of lethargic inactivity when there will be neither hot and cold nor night and day, but a huge mass of uniform desolation devoid of life and available energy. It is, of course, clear that nothing could be of more interest to us than the relation of the material universe to our personal interests.

In the discussion referred to General Smuts, who addressed the meeting as a "philosopher," seemed to resent the discussion of the matter from a merely material point of view, omitting all reference to our human characteristics and our ultimate destiny. Dr. Barnes seemed to be disedified for the same reason. Sir Oliver Lodge reminded the meeting that "Section A" expressly omitted the factors included by life. "As soon as a thing shows signs of life Section A passes it on to other sections." This is surely the correct attitude to adopt. There is only one way in which life affects the laws of nature, and that, while very wonderful, is outside the laws of matter. A human agent can decide whether a lever is to go right or left, as in the case of an electric switch. In either case the same amount of material energy is expended. But a free agent can decide without any expenditure of energy whether it move one way or the other. Pulling the lever to the right may produce results which are known and which can be anticipated; pulling it to the left may precipitate a catastrophe which no knowledge of cause and effect could with certainty predict. Physical science supposes that no such influence intervenes. Material nature is, when left to itself, "deterministic," and, did we know fully all the causes at work, we could infallibly predict the future. When free will intervenes such prediction is impossible.

An attempt has been made by the application of the "uncertainty" principle of Heisenberg to show that our study of the behaviour of electrons and short wave-lengths of light proves that the laws of physics can no longer be looked on as constant, but that they depend on a *chance* element. This principle states that while we can know with certainty either the position or velocity of an individual electron we cannot know both simultaneously. We need not here go into the details of this principle. The conclusion we are asked by certain scientists to accept appears to be that, since all material substances are to be considered as consisting of a definite arrangement of electrons and protons in time and space, we cannot know with certainty the laws of matter itself. But, in the first place, the fact that we do not know the exact position and velocity of a particle is no reason for denying that it has both. A mind capable of knowing *all* the forces at work could know with certainty both the position and velocity.

Again, this application of the principle overlooks the fact that in studying large masses of matter we are not concerned

with the behaviour of individuals. The case may be compared to a general election. We are not concerned with the *exact* opinions of each elector. Though the members of a "party" may be at variance among themselves on smaller issues, yet they are at one on some broad principle. The result does not indicate the exact mentality of each individual, but it does show the "average" tendency of the body and of each voter. Even in the case of free action this difference between the certainty with which we can arrive at a knowledge of a crowd as a whole implies no exact knowledge of each individual. In this case such knowledge would be impossible for any finite intellect. If we were to make a census of the number of people in a crowded street on a number of normal days we should find a remarkable agreement. We could arrive at a very exact law governing the relation between the number of people and the hour of the day, but we should be just as far as ever from an exact knowledge of the free presence or absence of an individual. It is surprising that this principle of "indeterminancy" has been taken so seriously by modern scientists, especially when we consider that all the laws of physics depend on this study of "mean" effects. Older—and many modern—scientists never introduced this principle into the study of gases, for example, as an excuse for assumptions which seem to have very uncertain foundations.

We have, in fact, to remember that the study of the constituents of matter is a very different thing from the study of objects which are known directly through the senses. In the study of nature we must arrive at a point when the study of the individual becomes physically impossible. Our senses, even with the aid of any scientific instrument however powerful, are limited. Our eyes cannot make use of wave-lengths of light less than a certain definite magnitude. The study of electrons, etc., according to the methods hitherto employed, involve the use of X-rays, gamma-rays, etc., so short that they do not affect our eye, but which cannot be satisfactorily applied to the measurement of these individual small particles because they immediately dislodge or disrupt the thing we are attempting to measure. In the other direction the power of a practical telescope is limited for other reasons, which make it certain that we can never hope to arrive at the knowledge of a universe greater than that which such instruments make attainable. We have, in fact, to confess that there are limits to our knowledge of the laws of nature. This does not make the existence of these laws less certain.

The meetings of the British Association have the advantage of keeping the man in the street in touch with the trend of modern scientific thought. This year's meeting was especially interesting in the fact that it encouraged a comparison with the state of science a hundred years ago with that of the present day. Then as now the problem of the nature of the universe was being discussed. The work of Clerk Maxwell had not

begun (this year is also the anniversary of his birth), but the foundations of modern views were then being laid especially by the genius of Sir William Rowan Hamilton. In that hundred years the imposing structure of the electro-magnetic theory of light has been erected, which at one time seemed to comprehend a full and satisfactory explanation of both light and all kinds of ether-waves. Discoveries made by the very application of this theory, however, presented problems which could only be solved by returning to some aspects of Newton's dethroned emission theory. We have, in fact, to-day arrived at an apparent fusion of two theories diametrically opposite. It is but a step in progress. A hundred years hence certain elements of the wave-theory of electrons will, no doubt, remain, but it is not imprudent to affirm that new facts will in turn make it, too, inadequate. In the meantime the result of scientific endeavour to arrive at the truth will furnish great advances in human knowledge. In this world our human intellects, unaided by Truth Itself, are not destined to reach a full understanding of nature's secrets, but to strive towards it.

## ROMAN DOCUMENTS

BY THE REV. A. BENTLEY, Ph.D., M.A.

CARDINAL BELLARMINE, SAINT AND DOCTOR.

Roberto Francesco Romolo Bellarmino, prince of post-Reformation apologists, was canonized along with the North American Jesuit Martyrs and the Franciscan Teofilo da Corte, on June 29th, 1930. As in the case of St. Peter Canisius, his canonization has been closely followed by a decree declaring him a Doctor of the Universal Church. The long eulogy in the Decretal Letter and the more recent document are here summarized.

The future saint was born of illustrious stock at Montepulciano in Tuscany on October 4th, 1542. His mother was a sister of Pope Marcellus II. Early successes at the Jesuit school of Montepulciano preceded a noviciate begun in Rome at the age of eighteen and followed by brilliant philosophical studies. He then taught humanities in Florence and Greek in Piedmont, studied theology at Padua and Louvain, and, although not yet a priest, instructed and preached in all four places with distinction. After his ordination to the priesthood, his teaching at Louvain brought many conversions, and within a brief space revealed a theologian of European reputation. St. Charles Borromeo and the Jesuits in Paris both asked for him. Gregory XIII, however, caused him to be recalled to Rome to fill the new chair of Controversy which Gregory had established to combat the errors of the Reformers. The brilliant lectures of the next eleven years reached a wide audience through their publication under the title of "*Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei*," and effected numerous conversions. In 1587, to have more leisure for writing, he was made Spiritual Director and afterwards Rector of the Collegio Romano, guiding St. Aloysius among others in the path of perfection.

Sixtus V employed him as theologian on Cardinal Gaetano's legation to France, and Gregory XIV found in him a strenuous collaborator in the Sistine revision of the Vulgate. After two years as Rector of the Neapolitan province, he was recalled by Clement VIII to become papal theologian, consultor of the Holy Office and finally Cardinal of Holy Church on March 3rd, 1599. The same pontiff consecrated him Archbishop of Capua in 1602. Three years were passed in the wise and energetic rule of his diocese, until, after the deaths of Clement VIII and Leo XI, Paul V summoned him once more to take up important work in the Curia. To this work, in which he gave evident proof of rare wisdom and learning, he joined the voluntary task of instructing the ignorant and the young in Christian Doctrine.

Besides his controversial writings, he has left valuable devotional treatises and a compendium of Christian Doctrine written with a simplicity and wisdom that have made it a model for catechisms.

Retiring to S. Andrea al Quirinale, our saint died (as he was born) on a feast of St. Francis, September 17th, 1621, being visited and consoled on his deathbed by the Holy Father himself. It was the feast of the Stigmata, a feast which had, through his influence, been extended to the Universal Church. He was buried in the Gesù and great crowds, moved by sheer conviction of his sanctity, surged around his body as about that of a saint, making his obsequies more like a triumphal procession than a funeral.

Miracles were attributed to his intercession, and the processes set on foot in Rome, Naples, Capua and Montepulciano led to the formal introduction of his cause in 1626, by decree signed by Pope Urban VIII. Delays ensued, until the cause was re-opened in 1920. The decree affirming the Heroic Virtues of the Servant of God was promulgated in the same year; two miracles were approved in 1923, and the declaration that it was now safe to proceed was followed by the Solemn Beatification by the Holy Father on May 13th, 1923. Cardinal Gasquet acted as Ponent of the Cause. In June, the body of the newly Beatified was solemnly transported from the Gesù to S. Ignazio.

Fresh miracles and renewed petitions led to the cause being resumed in 1925. The Decretal Letter describes in some detail the two cures which, after searching tests, were established beyond cavil in the completed process. One was the instantaneous and complete cure of Raymund Agras, suffering from acute diffused peritonitis (Alcover, Tarragona, 1925); the other the instantaneous and complete cure of Albinus Benz, suffering from an incurable anatomical pulmonary lesion (Cassovia, Hungary, 1905). An account of the closing stages of the process and the Solemn Canonization complete this historic record, which is signed by Pius, Bishop of the Catholic Church, and twenty-three Cardinals in Curia. (A.A.S., XXII, p. 593.)

The intellectual and spiritual stature of the "Hammer of Heretics" (Benedict XIV's name for St. Robert Bellarmine) is well brought out in the Apostolic Letter declaring him a Doctor of the Church. Already, as a mere youth, he had written the "*Institutiones linguae hebraicae*" and the erudite "*De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*." On the other hand, it may be said to have been a lifelong concentration on Sacred Scripture that bore fruit in the editing of the Septuagint and Vulgate; and over the whole range of sacred learning his teaching is completed in the voluminous correspondence still surviving. On questions of Faith, Ritual or Sacred Scripture, there are his learned *vota*, mostly unpublished, stored away in the archives of the papal Curia. His greatest work, the "*Disputationes de controversiis christianae*

Fidei," published from 1586 to 1593, first in three volumes, then in four, shows his mastery of the Ignatian method of combining positive and scholastic learning. To a quick natural intelligence and marvellous memory he brought a limpid and easy style, which avoided all useless detail and the florid diction characteristic of the age.

In slighter works, he vindicated the divinely established rights and privileges of the Roman Pontiff, and on the subject of papal infallibility the Fathers of the Vatican Council made full use of his teaching. His catechism has for three centuries supplied the food of doctrine in many parts of Europe and beyond. Learning and piety are combined in his commentary on the Psalms. His ascetical works have made him known all over the world as a most safe guide to Christian perfection. Such varied and distinguished examples of his genius show that there was hardly any branch of ecclesiastical study which our Saint did not cultivate with useful results.

Eminent ecclesiastical writers and sons of the Church, like St. Peter Canisius, St. Francis of Sales and St. Alphonsus, quoted him as though he were already a Doctor of the Church; and the petition for an official declaration has been pressed by Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops throughout the world. Cardinals Ehrle and Lépicié were commissioned to investigate the proposal by special mandate. After the S.C. had given its unanimous approval, and the Promotor Fidei had stated his views, the Pope finally pronounced St. Robert Bellarmine Doctor of the Universal Church, and extended to the whole Church his Mass and Office, with the rank of a minor double. May 13th is the *dies assignata* for the feast, instead of September 17th, which is the *dies natalis* of the Saint, and the date, incidentally, of the present Letter. (A.A.S., XXIII, p. 433.)



## BOOK REVIEWS

*Saint Anthony of Padua.* By Alice Curtayne. (Father Mathew Record Office, Dublin. pp. 118. 2s. 6d.)

Miss Curtayne combines the criticism of sources with such a grasp of tendencies, drifts, directions—what you will—that we see the road always clearly ahead and have no doubt of the reality of the country through which we are passing. Her Saint Anthony is both alive and defined; he is always decided in his own mind, and that helps to make him definite in ours. He plans his life from the beginning when he forsakes Court for Convent at fifteen, when he starts afresh two years later as a Canon Regular at Coimbra, and then after another eight years begins all over again as a Franciscan. The ecclesiastical world has not yet made up its mind about this new Order, but Anthony knows what he thinks of it. So far he has been a success, whether in the world or in the cloister; he is accomplished, attractive, cultured, really learned and spiritual. Now he must learn the lessons of failure. God rejects his hunger for martyrdom and casts him up at the Chapter of Mats, where St. Francis fails to recognize this new star in the Franciscan firmament. Anthony settles down to washing dishes in the obscurity of Monte Paolo: the heroism of his surrender to the higher life, his spectacular search after martyrdom in Morocco, has ended—in a kitchen.

But, as always, God was spiritualizing the man's natural energy and strength of decision; the science and culture that were his needed to blossom in the solitude above Forlì to bear fruit in his preaching to a busy world. After the unusually short testing of nine months, accident launched him on his career and practically from that day he knew no privacy. On the one occasion when his audience melted away, the fish rose to the surface of the sea to take their place, and so many witnesses were there to attest the wonder that the severest critic must accept its historicity. Even his personal devotions were spied upon by pious eyes at the key-hole, and when he preached no nave was big enough to hold the congregation. Men followed him by night as by day, and when he died they broke each other's heads to gain possession of his body.

In the full-blooded life of the thirteenth century, when the Pope was fiery old Ugolino and the Emperor was the enigmatic Frederick with his harem, his menagerie, his mechanics, astronomy, poetry, strategy, heresy and harrying of heresy; when Albigensians, Catharists and Waldensians disputed the mastery of public opinion with the Church, so that worldlings debated apologetics as we read economics; when revenge was a duty, valour and revolting cruelty part of the accepted code; when usury was condemned but as profitable and as general as to-day; when women could not wear enough clothes; when, in a word, all the sins were sins of commission, Anthony swept through the world as full-blooded as any, aggressive and

courteous, violent and chivalrous, ascetic and domestic, a challenge to the social injustices of his age, a picker of dogmatic quarrels, a healer of broken romances. His success was of a piece with the pressure of that century, and it wore him out in ten years. But in those ten years he had regained the control of men's minds for the Church; he had hit to heal, and, himself a Franciscan, he combined with the merry poverty of his leader the intellectual supremacy of a Dominic. He converted by argument as well as by example. His meals, his prayer, his preaching, even his retreats were a continuous attack on all the devils, waged by the whole man, eloquence, reasoning, miracle, personality. Is it any wonder that he was dead before his thirty-seventh birthday?

Such is Miss Curtayne's study of the man who, by a strange apotheosis, has become "the saint of household drudges, of all the tribe of pestered, badgered and harried folk." Though this small book is picturesque biography, I must insist that it is also critical. The author has worked from the sources and she rejects or accepts with complete objectiveness. If she has her own ideas of syntax at times, they only add to the vigorous charm of her style, and she paints so vitally that no one can stop to criticize. But the publishers have served Miss Curtayne with a misguided enthusiasm. The get-up of the book is attractive, yet it suggests that within its covers will be found an Anthony "idealized" for children; whereas such of their elders as open its pages will find instead the strong meat of a saint who faced vice, nay sought it out, and fought it to the death.

RICHARD L. SMITH.

*Patrologie: die Schriften der Kirchenvater und ihr Lehrgehalt.*

By Dr. Gerhard Rauschen. (Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau. pp. xx. and 441. 11.50 Marks.)

Professor Berthold Altaner, of the University of Breslau, deserves the thanks of all Patristic students for his new edition of Gerhard Rauschen's *Patrologie*. The great value of this new edition—in which the whole of the subject matter has been overhauled, and the clear brevity of the original respected—is the wealth of new material which it brings within the student's reach. In order to illustrate the range of his bibliographical information, Dr. Altaner tells us that he had noted no less than 2,300 patristic and doctrinal publications, the greater number of which (about 1,900) appeared between the years 1925 and 1931. Of this total he has given references to about 1,800 publications. The work, while complete in itself, is really supplementary to the earlier work of Bardenhewer and others, and for earlier bibliography they must still be consulted. In highly condensed form the dogmatic importance of the Fathers is emphasized. The new work done on the history of the Apostles' Creed is duly set out (pp. 22-24); the analysis of the sources of the so-called *Clementines* is given according

to Waitz, C. Schmidt and O. Cullmann (pp. 60-61); Dom Connolly's work on the so-called Egyptian Church Order, and on the *Didascalia Apostolorum* is mentioned (pp. 28-29). Shewring's *Passion of SS. Perpetua and Felicity* is not overlooked (p. 164). In its new form Rauschen-Altaner's *Patrologie* will render many services to workers in the fields of Theology and Patrology.

E. MYERS.

*Introduction to the Theological Summa of St. Thomas.* By Dr. Martin Grabmann. Translated by John S. Zybura, Ph.D. (Herder. 7s. pp. 220—x.)

This translation of Dr. Grabmann's well known work will prove both useful and interesting to all students of St. Thomas. It supplies the historical setting of the Summa among the other theological productions of the great scholastic era and, more important still, among the other works of the Angel of the Schools. Very interesting is the account of the growth out of the master's actual teaching of the Quaestiones Disputatae and the Quaestiones Quodlibetales. The two Summae are in a different category, though they too are intended for the use of students and the Summa Theologica is designed "for the instruction of beginners." Dr. Grabmann writes with all the enthusiasm of a life-long student of St. Thomas.

T. E. F.

*Foundations of Thomistic Philosophy.* By A. D. Sertillanges, O.P. Translated by Godfrey Anstruther, O.P. (Sands. 3s. 6d. pp. 255.)

"Every earnest thinking man who wishes to know more about his religion—and every Catholic implicitly professes to be such—must take at least some sort of interest in this teaching [of St. Thomas]." To enable the "ordinary man," the "general run of people," to meet this obligation is the declared object of the learned author of this short account of Thomistic philosophy. It is to be feared that readers unfamiliar with metaphysics will find the book very difficult reading especially the first chapter on Being and Knowledge with its insistence on the sublime notion of the intellect as *potens omnia fieri*. Whoever can assimilate that argument ought to be able to comprehend the succeeding chapters on God, Creation, Providence, Nature and Life, The Human Soul, Morality. Students who are more or less conversant with these topics will find the treatment both stimulating and enlightening. Many whose philosophy goes no deeper or wider than the ordinary manuals may be impressed by the coherence of unadulterated Thomism, and perhaps they will be occasionally shocked by the light-hearted way in which the author discards some of the "proofs" which they have been at such great pains to learn, e.g., the argument from "entropy" and those based on the impossibility of an infinite series.

It is a refreshing book and one to be cordially recommended to many to whom it is not directly addressed, but who are, very properly, more conscious than is the man in the street of an obligation to take an interest in the teaching of St. Thomas.  
T. E. F.

*Ecclesiastical Greek for Beginners.* By J. E. Lowe, M.A.  
(Burns, Oates & Washbourne. pp. 148. 5s.)

Encouraged no doubt by the well-deserved success which has attended what Fr. Martindale calls her "Latin Apostolate," Miss Lowe has now given us an admirable Greek primer. In a modestly-worded preface she tells us that her little work is intended for the man in the street who wishes to acquire, with a minimum amount of effort, enough Greek to enable him to read with understanding, if not with ease, the New Testament in the original. Hence, there are no elaborate rules, no bewildering lists of exceptions. It is Greek-made-easy, in so far as that is possible.

However, the attempt at simplicity does not involve the omission of anything essential. Briefly, but completely, all the important rules are given and illustrated with well-chosen examples. Important differences between Classical and New Testament usages are duly noted. A summary of accidence gives all the paradigms that even an advanced student would require, while the summary of syntax contains all the rules clearly and simply set forth with admirable examples, almost all taken directly from the New Testament.

Especially pleasing is the choice of Greek and English sentences in the Exercises for Translation. Some are the ordinary stock sentences found in every Greek primer (and scarcely ever elsewhere), but many are New Testament texts which as sentences for translation seem delightfully novel to most of us whose first Greek sentences told only of trees on the island admired by the sailors or of the ambassadors who were sent to ask for peace. In a racy Introduction Fr. Martindale hopes for a wide diffusion of the little volume and a serious use of it by many. We wholeheartedly support his recommendation.

BERNARD PATTEN.

## REVIEW OF REVIEWS

In our number for February, 1930, we drew our readers' attention to an able article by Professor Robert d'Harcourt on *L'Opinion Catholique Allemande et la victoire d'Hitler*. In ETUDES for December 5th, 1931, the same writer has some twenty pages on *L'Opinion Catholique Allemande et le réalisme politique en face de la France*. The problem he analyzes is the reaction of German Catholics to a suggested Franco-German *rapprochement*: he brings together a number of statements by representative German Catholics to enable us to form some impression of prevailing attitudes of mind. The tendency is to concentrate upon the facts and to get away from theories and rhetoric and the preaching of peace to other nations. What is at the root of the actual mistrust of Germany prevailing in France? German Catholic writers point to lavish expenditure on luxurious enjoyment of every kind, the pouring out of money on monumental constructions, foreign travel, commercial equipment—all of which contrasts strangely with the cries of distress sent out to the creditor nations. They stress the deplorable impression all this leaves on the really typical Frenchman: thrifty and perfectly happy with a small income in a quiet corner of the country. A second reason put forward by certain writers is the tendency of the German to refuse to see the reality, and to live in a romantic world of aspirations and illusions of an imagined future. They see the folly of the violently provocative attitude taken up towards France, the threats of a Germany powerless to carry them out; the catastrophic character of the policy of repudiating the Versailles Treaty. France, they say, is the first political power in Europe: face the fact!

The main body of the Centre Party cannot be said to have got so far. They are sore at the humiliation of their country, but they recognize that political action must be guided by reason and not by sentiment. The last elections gave way to Hitlerite sentiment, but it is useless to press the pace, the only outcome at present can be disaster. The tone, here, is different. The *mentality* of the "Right" parties is not what is repudiated, it is only their *methods*. "We should like to—but we are not able!" You are in too great a hurry, you are spoiling the game. France is too powerful. Beware.

The Hitlerite appeal to the glories of the German race to the exclusion of "the Romano-Marxist internationalism" has attracted many Protestant Pastors. Two-thirds of Hitler's followers are Protestant and the day he drops his anti-Roman campaign Protestants will have lost their chief reason for devotion to his cause. The strength of a Brüning in contrast

with Hitler lies in his ability to face the hard realities of the situation. To rule is not to dream nor to smash. It is to attain a maximum result with the *data* to hand. Reasonable Germans realize that. German Catholics have come to see the importance of "Realism," of facing facts, in their dealings with France. This fundamental conviction (spontaneous in some, resigned in others) is leading to the realization of the necessity of an understanding with France, and of the necessity of taking practical means to bring it about.

The skilled pen of Père de Mondadon depicts in touching strain the truly Christian pathos of Veuillot's bereavements: *Les Lettres de deuil de Louis Veuillot*. In *La Tunisie ouvrière et rurale* René Vanlande shows us the problems besetting the organization and protection of labour in one corner of North Africa. Our sympathy goes out to the peasant who has little to say for himself and for whom few have any care. Education has much to do, though much has already been done.

COLLECTANEA FRANCISCANA for October opens with *De fontibus litterariis ad vitam S. Francisci Assisiensis speciatim pertinentibus Brevis disquisitio*, which takes the form of an annotated catalogue of the sources, with a select bibliography of the chief modern books on the subject. Father Louis de Gonzague continues in French his study on the old Capuchin missionaries in Syria and their Arabic manuscript work. Father Romuald contributes a densely-packed Latin article on the fundamental principles of Aesthetics. There is also an interesting letter now first printed giving an account of the six-months' journey undertaken in 1692, by a Capuchin Missionary, in order to open a Mission at "Gangia," a town just over the Georgian frontier, in Persia.

THE MONTH for December, 1931, helps us to realize in its article on *St. Robert Bellarmine, Doctor of the Church*, the full meaning of the belated honours paid to the great vindicator of the rights of the Pope. Father Joseph Keating's *Catholics and Disarmament* deserves the close attention of every priest: "In spite of its imperfect structure, its stunted growth, its inadequate performance, the League remains the only approach, hitherto perceptible, to the Christian ideal of international relations. Hence it has met the hostility of all to whom that ideal is strange. Its whole eleven years of existence has been a running fight with militarists, war-traders, imperialists, political Darwinians. They are assailing it to-day, on the eve of the Disarmament Conference, with renewed vigour. Last May, one of our two would-be Press-Dictators, opened an attack on the League of Nations, and exhorted Great Britain to leave it. It was an appalling exhibition of the reckless irresponsibility with which Press-influence is sometimes wielded. And it is being repeated at the present moment, apropos of the Manchuria question in more than one catch-penny paper." "It is encouraging to know that responsible Catholic opinion at home and abroad is working on the lines



suggested by the Pope." If only Catholics act together in the true spirit of their faith, the peace of the world should be safe.

ANGELICUM for December, 1931, has a noteworthy Latin article by Father J. Vosté, O.P., whose *Studia Paulina* (1928) were so helpful, on *Sancti Pauli Conversio*; the threefold narrative is subjected to minute scrutiny and its historicity vindicated. Various heterodox theories are set out and dealt with in the *excursus* on the supernatural character of St. Paul's conversion.

*Peace among the American States*, by Dr. Marie R. Madden in *THOUGHT* for December, 1931, is worth careful study. It is based upon the papers of the Sixth Conference of American States held at Havana in 1928 and treats of the reorganization of the Pan-American Union and of the principles proposed for the codification of public international law for the two Americas. We are reminded that "Spain and Portugal introduced to the peoples of the New World the principles of Western-European Christian civilization, and laid on these the foundations of new institutions." "On the Atlantic coast of North America the English in turn established a culture informed by their own spirit, though not without points common to the continental European heritage." The two groups break away from Europe and meet on the Rio Grande and in the Caribbean. The date of the first official meeting is given as 1826, with the Monroe doctrine as a dark background, and "at a time when the structure—or better yet to borrow a scholastic term, the form—of capitalistic industrial society was ready for both, or either, parties to adopt. As a matter of fact both eventually slipped into it, but in neither case did it fit as the soul does the body. The essence of the form of such a society transcends nationality, transcends politics. Its distinctive points of style are materialism, money (cash, credit, representative, what you will), dominance and control.

It was assumed by the North Americans in its Anglo-Roman dress, but when the Latin Americans came to adopt it they found themselves embarrassed in the adjustment by the dominance of their old form, the Scholastic-Graeco-Roman, which they had inherited from Spain. A similar embarrassment was felt in the North, though to nothing like the same extent. The clash for the dominance of one or the other of these forms has marked each meeting of the two Societies, but the significance of this is obscured, since the discussion is always held in the terminology of the capitalistic Anglo-Roman form. This has created all the difficulties, and there will be no peace until this is recognized."

Sixty-two years after the Panama Conference, a new Conference authorized by Act of Congress, May 29th, 1888, led in the following year to the Pan-American Union: but at once the clash of the two "forms" of society was apparent, as is shown by the account of the discussions given. "As we have

said all of the discussions on the relationships of the American States have been arranged and held in the atmosphere of a capitalistic-industrial society the essential principle of which is the dominance of the economic interest of man, a system of economies based upon interest, the profit motive and the two classes—capital owners and wage-earners—may not in itself demand that this interest be exclusive and solitary, though brilliant minds have held that it does . . . But it does, however, demand that it, the economic interest, be dominant and control . . .”

“ But also in the order of things and of man, there is demanded an order, a discipline of action for the establishment of these institutions which implies a plan. Who is to impose this plan? Ultimately, of course, and *reductive*, God; but secondarily those who exercise His authority which in this respect is delegated to the Church and to the State. In the one it is immediately administered by the Pope and the hierarchy, and in the other by what is technically called the government, that is, in the case of the American Republics, those agencies, president, council, court, legislature as designated in their respective constitutions, laws or agreements. In modern terminology any discussion of these latter agencies is qualified by the adjective *political*.”

Now both “ forms ” of society, the capitalistic and its predecessor, recognize that there must be an agency to impose the plan and keep due order in action. They differ in that the capitalistic uses the adjective *economic*, and the other *ecclesiastico-political* . . . Owing to the clash in modern society of these two “ forms,” and to the fact that the capitalistic assumes that the political institution of government is on an equality with all other institutions, a paralysis results from the unstable equilibrium of such an equation. To avoid this some institution must take the lead. This must be the economic says the capitalistic society, since economic considerations dominate and absorb the life of man. So the economic institution dominates and rules. The essential falsity of such a principle arouses a storm of protest . . .”

This is the inner meaning of all the debates in the International American Conferences, concludes Dr. Madden. The Problem of Peace, then, is to resolve these confusions into clear statements of tenable principles . . . but the necessary principles cannot be stated validly until the proper definitions of authority, of sovereignty, of law, of the State, of politics, and of institutions, are established. Put plainly the traditional logical political conceptions (Catholic in origin) of South American statesmen are bewildered by the merely economic opportunism of the Big Finance of the English-speaking North American world, which seeks to be a law unto itself. In realms that matter, fifty years of Pan-American Conference have achieved nothing. The League of Nations has nothing of which to be ashamed!

E. M.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE PROTOEVANGELIUM.

Canon William Vaughan, St. John's, Poulton-le-Fylde, has sent to the Editors a manuscript dealing with the interpretation of Genesis 3, 15, offered in the August number of the CLERGY REVIEW by Fr. Sutcliffe, S.J. In view of its length it has been judged advisable to present to our readers the following summary. Surprise is expressed that Fr. Sutcliffe declares "that when the context is examined, it becomes plain that the primary literal meaning of the Woman must be regarded as none other than Eve herself." This surprise is occasioned by the fact that such an interpretation should be put forward after "Pope Pius IX in promulgating the definition of the Immaculate Conception taught in accordance with the teaching of the Fathers and theologians that the merciful Redeemer of the human race, Christ Jesus Our Lord, was manifestly foreshown and His Immaculate Mother, the *ever* blessed Virgin Mary, clearly meant when Almighty God foretold the remedy prepared from the beginning when turning to the serpent He said, as the Infallible Truth, who can neither deceive nor be deceived, 'I will place enmities between thee and the Woman, and between thy seed and her seed, she shall crush thy head.' And further in his infallible pronouncement, as head of the infallible Church, the saintly Pontiff says that as Christ, the Mediator of God and man, took our human nature and blotting out the decree of the handwriting against us, fastened it triumphantly to the Cross, so the Blessed Virgin, united to Him by the most close and inseparable bond, together with Him and through Him nourished *everlasting* enmity against the poisonous serpent, and achieving the most complete victory over him crushed his head with her immaculate foot." The view put forward by Fr. Sutcliffe is considered at least rash "after Rome has spoken and the question settled once and for ever and without any fear or favour that the woman can in no sense be any other than Mary the Sinless, the Mother of Jesus our mediator, and not Eve, the sinful mother of Cain the murderer."

Finally, appeal is made to the authority of Pius X. Mary "must have been in the mind of all the Saints of old, as Pius X, Encyc. says, for Noe must have thought of her, when he was shut up in the Ark and gazed on the rainbow of God's promise and the dove's olive branch of peace. And David, too, when afterwards he escorted the holy Ark of the Lord. And Elias, when he gazed on the cloud that rose up out of the sea. And Gedeon, when he saw the mystic fleece always dry when all around was wet. And Jacob, when he beheld heaven's angelic

ladder. And Abraham, when stopped by the Angel from slaying his son. And Moses, when he looked on the bush that burnt and was not consumed. And God Himself had her in mind, when He dried the tears of man's malediction. And even the fallen Eve herself must have had her in mind when she heard her injured Creator crying out to the wily serpent that seduced her in the Garden of Eden, that a second Eve, sinless and stainless, would come to save her and her seed from the slavery of Satan and sin."

#### FR. SUTCLIFFE'S REPLY.

If I may take the last point first, I should agree at once that if Noe thought of Mary, when he gazed on the rainbow, Eve certainly must have done so, when she heard the first divine promise of salvation made to the fallen race. But I think others besides myself will be surprised to learn that Pius X ever said anything of this kind. No exact reference is given, and only one passage is known to me where Pius X speaks of our Blessed Lady and the rainbow in the same context, and it may be that this is the passage intended. It will be more satisfactory to quote the words textually. They occur in the Encyclical Letter *Ad diem*, given February 2nd, 1904, in which the Pope proclaimed an extraordinary jubilee in honour of the fiftieth anniversary of the definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God. The words occur towards the close of the letter, and are as follows: "In funesta sane incidimus tempora . . . Attamen, in hoc quasi malorum diluvio, iridis instar Virgo clementissima versatur ante oculos, faciendae pacis Deum inter et homines quasi arbitra. 'Arcum meum ponam in nubibus, et erit signum foederis inter me et inter terram,' Gen. 9, 15. Saeviat licet procella et caelum atra nocte occupetur; nemo animi incertus esto. Mariae adspectu placabitur Deus et parcat." It will be agreed, I think, that this text in no way suggests that Noe understood the rainbow to signify Our Lady. It is the eyes of our generation that are directed towards her as towards a rainbow in the heavens holding out to us the promise of the divine protection.

As regards the teaching of Pope Pius IX, his words on the Protoevangelium were set at the head of my article as the authoritative exposition of the mind of the Church. As is plain for all to see, the Pope there teaches that in the Protoevangelium Our Lady is *designata*. Whether the words *clare aperteque*, which certainly qualify the word *praemonstratus* used of Our Blessed Lord, also qualify *designata* is a question difficult to decide. It must, however, be pointed out, in view of a phrase of Canon Vaughan's, that the Pope is not here making an "infallible pronouncement as head of the infallible Church." The infallible pronouncement of the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* declares the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception to be a truth divinely revealed to the Church. That truth and that only the Pope here teaches with the full authority of his office as the Vicar of Christ. In spite of its not being infallible,

nonetheless, every loyal Catholic accepts also the teaching of the Pope on the meaning of the Protoevangelium. But, as is well known and as the very nature of papal documents requires, their wording is very carefully chosen; and only that meaning which is compatible with the strict interpretation of the words. is to be considered the meaning intended. Now in the present case the Pope teaches that in the Protoevangelium Our Lady is "indicated" (*designata*). He abstains from saying in what way she is there indicated, whether, namely, in the literal or in the typical sense. We are, therefore, left to understand that the Pope did not wish to decide in which of these senses Our Lady is indicated. Now both these senses, needless to say, are true senses of Scripture, senses, that is, intended by the primary author of Holy Scripture, the Holy Ghost Himself. Some passages have only a literal sense; others have both a literal and a typical sense. Take, for example, the text, "Neither shall you break a bone thereof," Exodus 12, 46, Douay version. These words were fulfilled in the person of our Blessed Lord, John 19, 36. In their typical sense they refer to Him. This, however, does not exclude the fact that in their literal and primary sense the words express a command given by God Almighty, not about Our Lord, but about the Pascal Lamb, which was a type of Christ. To return now to the Protoevangelium, the question discussed in my article was, in which of these two senses is Our Lady there designated. To satisfy the devotion of the faithful, it may be sufficient to know the fact that she is there indicated; but if, in accordance with the admonition of St. Peter, we wish to be "ready always to satisfy everyone that asketh" 1 Pet. 3, 15, it is necessary to proceed further and enquire in which of the two senses of Holy Scripture that indication is given.

One other passage in the communication printed above requires a word of explanation. Eve is described as "the sinful mother of Cain the murderer." The purpose of this description appears to be to suggest the incompatibility of any connection between Eve and Our Blessed Lady. Yet Adam equally had sinned, and Adam equally was the father of the murderer Cain; and nonetheless, St. Paul does not hesitate to call him "a figure of him who was to come," Rom. 5, 14, nor to write: "The first Adam was made into a living soul, the last Adam into a quickening spirit," 1 Cor. 15, 45. And following this teaching of St. Paul's the Fathers love to dwell on the typical relation of Eve to Mary. Eve was the mother of all the living in the order of nature, Mary the mother of us all in the order of grace.

There are few references in the Fathers to the Protoevangelium, and if anything, they tend to support the typical interpretation. St. Justin in his Dialogue with the Jew Trypho, n. 100, Migne, P.G. 6,700, after mentioning the generation of the Son from the Father before all creatures, goes on to say that He became man through the Virgin (an allusion to Isaias



7, 14) "in order that the way in which the disobedience occasioned by the serpent took its beginning should also be the way in which it should be ended. For it was in the time of her virginity that Eve conceived by the word received from the devil, and brought forth disobedience and death; but Mary received faith and joy, and answered the good tidings of the angel Gabriel . . . 'Be it done unto me according to thy word.' And through her He has been born . . . through whom God destroys the serpent and the men and angels who have become like to him." This passage shows that for Justin Gen. 3, 15 is Messianic, and that in his text, as is otherwise known, the subject of the verb was in the masculine, and not as in the Vulgate, in the feminine.

In the work *Against Heresies* of St. Irenaeus we read in a passage of which the Greek original has been lost, lib. iii, c. 23, Migne, P.G. 7,964: "He placed enmity between the serpent and the woman and her seed, watching one another, the latter having the power, though bitten in the foot, to crush the enemy's head, the latter biting and slaying, and hindering the steps of man till the coming of the seed predestined to crush its head, which seed was the offspring of Mary." This passage, again, is patient of both interpretations. St. Irenaeus is satisfied that Mary is signified by the woman, but he does not stay to ask whether in the literal or in the typical sense, though the words rather suggest that the enmity was actively expressed through the ages up to the coming of Christ, in whom and through whom alone the actual victory was achieved.

St. Epiphanius explains the passage according to the typical interpretation, *Adversus Haereses*, Lib. iii, cc. 18f., Migne, P.G. 42,729. He says first that in Eve was signified Mary, and works out the parallelism in various ways. Then after quoting Gen. 3, 15, he says: "Nowhere is found (mention of) seed of a woman; unless according to the hidden meaning (lit. enigma) in the case of Eve is understood the enmity towards her offspring of the serpent and the devil, filled with envy, that was in it. Yet at any rate in the most complete manner all cannot have been fulfilled in her; but it will be fulfilled really and truly in the seed, holy, elect, and unique, which was begotten of Mary alone without the help of man." This passage of St. Epiphanius is the more noteworthy for the reason that he is the first definitely to consider in some detail how the text is to be understood. He allows that the prophecy is fulfilled partially in Eve and her offspring, but completely and fully only in Our Lord and His Mother. For the rest it will suffice to give references to St. Isidore of Pelusium, Epist. 426, Migne, P.G. 78, 417, and to Ps. Hieronymus, Ep. de Viro Perf. 6, Migne, P.L. 30, 85. The writer of this letter, who is the only one definitely to exclude Eve, was identified by Vallarsi with St. Maximus of Turin, but this identification was rejected by the editor of St. Maximus' works, Migne, P.L. 57,933f.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM.



